SHOUT
SHARE
IT

Śāntideva's

BODHICHARYĀVATĀRA

Śāntideva's
BODHICHARYĀVATĀRA

Original Sanskrit text with English translation and exposition based on Prajnākarmati's Panjikā

By

PARMANANDA SHARMA

VOLUME - II

ADITYA PRAKASHAN
NEW DELHI

Q 3142 .E5 S27 1990 v.2

First published : 1990
© Parmananda Sharma

Rs. 550 (set)

ISBN. 81-85179-13-1(set)
81-85179-14-X(Vol. I)
81-85179-15-8(Vol. II)

Published by Pradeep Kumar Goel for
Aditya Prakashan, F 14/65, Model Town II, Delhi-110 009
Printed at D.K. Fine Art Press, Delhi- 110 052

VII—Veerya - Pārmitā

PERFECTION OF VALOUR

एवं क्षमो भजेद्वीर्यं वीर्ये बोधिर्यतः स्थिता।
न हि वीर्यं विना पुण्यं यथा वायुं विना गति : ।।१ ।।

1. Having thus acquired forbearance one should practise 'veerya', valour or effort wherein bodhi dwells. There can be no acquisitions of 'punya' or merit without effort just as there can be no movement without wind.

In the manner explained in the previous chapter, one can attain the quality of 'kśānti' or forbearance. Having acquired this quality one must start strenuous efforts for further 'sādhanā. It is constant effort alone which leads to bodhi; in constant effort awakening dwells. 'Veerya' keeps a person on his toes, constantly struggling against odds, enduring 'dukha' and realising the significance of 'dukha' as a means towards bodhi. Constant effort helps him in 'punya-sambhār' or the accumulation of merit through 'jnāna' or true knowledge. It is the wind alone that makes the flame flicker. It is effort alone that spells for movement or progress in accumulation of 'punya' and in developing 'prajnā'. These two — the perfection of 'jnaña' and the accumulation of merit — will lead to 'buddhattva'.

किं वीर्यं कुशलोत्साहस्तद्विपक्षः क उच्यते।
आलस्यं कुत्सिताशक्तिर्विषादात्मावमन्यना।।२ ।।

2. What is 'veerya'? It is striving after wholesome

pursuits. What are its opposing factors? They are lethargy, attachment for reprehensible things, despondency and self-despise.

All effort must be directed towards the pursuit of wholesome activity; charity or 'dāna' is one such activity. The opponents of 'veerya' or valour are many. Lethargy puts shackles around one's feet, and thus erodes even the will to work. One gets so much engrossed with worldly affairs that one goes on postponing the effort to practise dharma. How can then one accumulate any merit at all? One goes on pursuing illusory shadows and does not practise 'nivritti' or detachment from unwholesome conduct. This ultimately leads to despondence and grief and one can never undertake the arduous job of following the bodhi-path. Sometimes one's mind is invaded by such a feeling of inferiority complex that one's whole will gets debilitated. Feelings such as 'I am a nobody; what can I achieve in life; I am a wreck; I am luckless,' etc. are totally self-demeaning and cut at the very roots of both physical and mental effort.

अव्यापारसुखास्वादनिद्रापाश्रयतृष्णया ।
संसारदुःखानुद्वेगादालस्यमुपजायते ।।३ ।।

3. 'Ālasya' or lethargy is born of the taste for illusory joys,' craving for sleep and an absence of disillusionment with 'samsāra'.

How is indolence born? What causes 'ālasya' or lethargy? The answer is attachment to worldly things. Whereas 'samsāra' or cyclic existence is unreal like all other phenomena, its many lures tempt us to take it as real and palpable. This creates a taste for illusory joys and fake pleasures. We love sleep more than work, indolence more than effort and shadows more than reality.

We fail to realise that all phenomena are 'nirvyāpārā. Consequently, ignorance continues to rule over our minds and we stay put in the welter of 'akuśala karma' like worms wriggling in a dirty drain.

क्लेशवागुरिकाघ्रातः प्रविष्टो जन्मवांगुराम्।
किमद्यापि न जानासि मृत्योर्वदनमागतः।।४।।
स्वयूथायान्मार्यमाणांस्त्वं क्रमेणैव न पश्यसि।
तथापि निद्रां यास्येव चण्डालमहिषो यथा।।५।।

4-5. Caught in the mesh of 'kleśas', you have entered the snare of birth. Why do you not even now realise that you are lying in the mouth of death?

Don't you see how systematically your own kind is being killed? Still you are behaving like a buffalo asleep in the presence of a 'chandala' or butcher.

The 'kleśas' are like a fisherman's net or a hunter's noose. When one gets caught in the snare of disturbing conceptions, the giant round-about of cyclic existence, of birth and death, is set in motion. Sure enough, death follows birth and vice-versa, and the endless chain persists. One's friends and relatives with whom one has lived and played and laughed ever since one's childhood, die before one's eyes; the agents of death arrive and drag them away. However, like a buffalo condemned to be slaughtered and the butcher's sword breathing over its neck, one goes on chewing the cud of illusory joys like an ignorant fool.

The word 'vāgura' meas a net, a trap,' a snare, a noose for catching deer or wild animals. It could also be used for a fisherman's net.

'Vāgurikā' is a deer-catcher, a hunter. 'Chāndāla' means one of low, condemned class; hence a butcher, because only 'chāndālas' were entrusted with such tasks.

यमेनोद्वीक्ष्यमाणस्य बद्धमार्गस्य सर्वतः ।
कथं ते रोचते भोक्तुं कथं निद्रा कथं रति : ।।६ ।।
यावत्संभृतसंभारं मरणं शीघ्रमेष्यति ।
संत्यज्यापि तदाऽलस्यमकाले किं करिष्यसि ।७ ।।

6-7. Constantly under the surveillance of the lord of death, with all routes barred, how do you relish enjoyments, sleep and attachment?

As you collect the material (for wholesome acts), death will surely come too soon. Even if you give up lethargy at that in-oppotune time, what use will it be?

Death always approaches unseen, sudden and fast. It keeps no time-table. Sentient beings move about their earthly chores day and night under its ever-watching, ever-devouring eyes. It is, therefore, surprising that people should continue eating, sleeping, making love and indulging in all kinds of enjoyments under the very shadow of death. The span of life is too brief to collect sufficient 'punya', for death knocks at the door too soon. Even then, some people go on putting off the work of 'punya-sambhāra' till the last. What merit can be accumulated at the fag end of life when the messengers of death are already round the corner. Hence, why not perform wholesome acts right now and ever afterwards so that enough merit is earned for the next life. Do not postpone such conduct to an unknown future which may never come, for all beings are like condemned prisoners and death is a swift executioner.

इदं न प्राप्तमारब्धमिदमर्धकृतं स्थितम्।
अकस्मान्मृत्युरायातो हा हतोऽस्मीति चिन्तयन्।।८।।
शोकवेगसमुच्छ्वूनसाश्रुरक्तेक्षणाननान्।
बन्धून्निराशान् संपश्यन् यमदूतमुखानि च।।९।।
स्वपापस्मृतिसंतप्तः शृण्वन् नादांश्च नारकान्।
त्रासोच्चारविलिप्ताङ्गो विह्वलः किं करिष्यसि।।१०।।

8-10. 'I have not achieved this', 'this I started and is only half-done', — while you are thinking like this, death overtakes suddenly and you exclaim:' Oh, I am undone!'

What will your restlessness do to see the messengers of death when your relatives, with tears flowing down their faces and eyes swollen and red with sorrow, finally become helpless?

Restless then, what will you do when you are being tormented by the memory of your own sins and you are hearing hell-shouts and, out of sheer fright, you are covering your body with your own excreta.

Fear grips a person as death suddenly arrives at his door. He becomes painfully aware of his own acts of omission and commission. His failures and failings look him in the face and he exclaims: 'Oh, I have not been able to do this, I have not done that. I have missed such and such a goal; I started this project but could not complete it; this have I done and this has remained undone, etc. Such-like and many more thoughts trouble the mind in his failing moments and he is filled with utter frustration. In the meanwhile, his near and dear ones gather around his bed and start wailing loudly. The dying man recollects his own sins and shudders at the prospect of

his consignment to hell; nay he even imagines he hears the loud wailings and shouts of victims suffering in hell. The whole prospect makes him a mad wreck wallowing in the scum of his own exrecta. Confused and confounded and deprived of his powers of speech, body and mind, he is now a lifeless corpse. What a sad end, what a debacle for this so-called crown of creation! Does it not provide food enough for thought?

जीवमत्स्य इवास्मीति युक्तं भयमिहैव ते।
किं पुनः कृतपापस्य तीव्रान्नरकदुःखतः।।११।।

11. Fear is natural to me as to a live fish. Why then, is there no fear in me of the severe hells after having committed evil deeds?

Man, in this śloka, has been compared to a live fish ('jīva-matsya'), because his lot is no different from that of a fish which is being kept alive only for being eaten up later. The fish-eaters rear fish in their fisheries, feed them and protect them in order that they could eat them at will. Thus, in actual fact, these fishes are not really protected or safe. Their very security is a camouflage for their impending death. Similarly, the fear of inevitable death must always weigh with people in life. But, they not only do forget this fact of death, they even continue indulging in evil karma which is a sure pass-port to hells. The fear of hell-tortures must make people desist from 'pāpa'.

स्पृष्ट उष्णोदकेनापि सुकुमार प्रतप्यसे।
कृत्वा च नारकं कर्म किमेवं स्वस्थमास्यते।।१२।।

12. O delicate body! You burn even when sprink-

led over with hot water. How healthy will you be by committing evil deeds fit enough to lead (you) to hell?

Even a little heat.burns the skin and causes pain. Pour a little hot water and the skin will get scalded. Imagine the burning fires and boiling cauldrons of 'avīchī' hell; imagine its rivers of fire, its stygian pools.Could such a weakling delicate thing as this body be capable of going through these hell-fires? Certainly, they would not be conducive to its health. Therefore, one must refrain from evil conduct and use one's body for beneficial ends so as to ensure 'sugati' or birth in higher realms.

निरुद्यमफलाकांक्षिन् सुकुमार बहुव्यथ।
मृत्युग्रस्तोऽमराकार हा दुःखित विहन्यसे।।१३।।

13. Those who desire results without hard work, o delicate body! suffer severely. In the clutches of death, they wail like gods: 'Oh, I am killed by dukha'.

If a person does not so act as to collect merit, his gain will be nil. How can he achieve happiness and peace and release from sorrow? For him who can not endure dukha, dukha multiplies manifold. Whereas suffering should have been instrumental in leading him to the stage of the cessation of suffering, it, instead, leads to augmentation of suffering in his case. The sword of death constantly hangs over his head whereas he is not at all mindful of it. He behaves as if he is immortal like gods. He never ponders over the implications of his inevitable doom. It is this infatuation with life that adds to his dukha. Hence, 'udyama' or hard work is the only key to unlock the door of joy and overcome the fear of death.

मानुष्यं नावमासाद्य तर दुःखमहानदीम्।
मूढ कालो न निद्राया इयं नौर्दुर्लभा पुनः।।१४।।

14. Relying on the boat of human existence, cross the great river of dukha. O fool! this is no time for sleep, because this boat is not easy to come by again.

Although human life is full of dukha but this very human existence can be made an instrument for overcoming dukha. This body is the boat which can help us cross the turbulent river of suffering. Human life should not be wasted in lethargy. It should be yoked to beneficial pursuit so that, through the performance of meritorious karma, merit multiplies and dukha is terminated. This is all the more important because human birth is attained after many inferior births through hundreds of 'yonis'. The human body is the instrument for practising dharma: 'śariramādyam khalu dharma sādhanam'. The boat of life has to be used with the support of 'veerya' (veeryāvalambena) or effort, valour, courage.

मुक्त्वा धर्मरतिं श्रेष्ठामनंतरतिसंततिम्।
रतिरौद्धत्यहास्यादौ दुःखहेतौ कथं तव।।१५।।
अविषादबलव्यूहतात्पर्यात्मविधेयता।
परात्मसमता चैव परात्मपरिवर्तनम्।।१६।।

15-16. Forsaking the noble joy of dharma which is a source of boundless happiness, why do you take delight in frivolous entertainments like the uppishness of laughter and of speech, — sources of dukha?

Shorn of despondence, full of a mass of strength, with cleverness and self-control, I

should generate 'veerya' or valour for exchanging self with others and for identification with others.

It is the pursuit of dharma alone which brings real happiness. Every other joy is ephemeral and ultimately leads to suffering. Guffaws of laughter, loud and unbridled speech, gossip-mongering etc. are frivolous activities and must be avoided. One should practise the cultivation of 'veerya' or mental valour by shedding all kinds of dispiritedness, amassing the massive 'bala' or strength of self-confidence through intelligence and self-control. Ultimately, one will be able to establish an identity with all sentient beings and feel that he and they are exchangeable entities. Such 'parātma-samatā' is the highest goal for a bodhisattva.

नैवावसादः कर्त्तव्य : कुतो मे बोधिरित्यतः ।
यस्मात्तथागतः सत्यं सत्यवादीद मुक्तवान् ।।१७ ।।
तेऽप्यासन् दंशमशका मक्षिकाः कृमयस्तथा ।
यैरुत्साहबलात्प्राप्ता दुरापा बोधिरुत्तमा ।१८ ।।

17-18. I should never become despondent thinking: 'how can I achieve bodhi?' For, Tathagata, the speaker of Truth, said thus: "Even they (i.e. the Buddhas and bohisattvas) were (in their various births) biting mosquitoes, flies and insects, who, through their courage, attained supreme bodhi, so hard to attain."

No inferiority complex should be allowed to invade the mind by imagining: 'Oh, I am so inept, so down and out; how can I achieve enlightenment?' Lord Buddha, whose word is truth itself, has certified that even Buddhas like

Sakyamuni and bodhisattvas like Ratna-śikhī and Dipankar-srijñana had to pass through many many rounds of birth and death before finally achieving their lofty status. They passed through such other births round after round. It was their 'veerya' or constant effort alone that led them to the pinnacle of bodhi, for they accumulated merit through 'veerya': वीरोत्कर्ष सामर्थ्यात् संभारान् संभृत्य। Once a person starts on the path with courage, there is nothing difficult for him to achieve: आरब्धवीर्यस्य न किंच्चिदुष्करमस्ति।

किमुताहं नरो जात्या शक्तो ज्ञातुं हिताहितम्।
सर्वज्ञनीत्यनुत्सर्गाद्बोधिं किं नाप्नुयामहम्।।१९।।

19. Then why should not I, born as a human being, capable of discriminating between what is beneficial and what is harmful, achieve bodhi if I do not forsake the teachings of bodhisattvas?

The path that the great bodhisattvas and other enlightened sages through their exemplary conduct have chartered for us, after roaming through hundreds of births, is easily available to us, the 'prathagjanās', to follow and achieve similar perfection. As human beings we have been endowed with intellect (buddhi) and discrimination (vijnānā). We can distinguish between the noble and the ignoble, the good and the bad, the beneficial and the harmful. If we follow the right path, as pointed out by Lord Buddha and the bodhisattvas, we are sure to reach the goal of emancipation from suffering.

अथापि हस्तपादादि दातव्यमिति मे भयम्।
गुरुलाघवमूढत्वं तन्मे स्यादविचारतः।।२०।।

20. I am rather afraid thinking that I may have to

give away my hands and feet. The distinction of big and small with me is only due to my ignorance.

Some people may feel frightened to read the accounts of the bodhisattvas' lives or those of Lord Buddha as found in the Jataka tales, depicting them sacrifice their limbs or whole bodies for the welfare of other beings, even offering themselves to beasts like a hungry tigress. 'How can I allow my hands or feet to be severed?' Some may ponder and shudder at the prospect. What is big and what is small? Who gives away and who receives? All is illusion, all unreal, non-existent. All fear is baseless. Hence the path of 'veerya' should not been forsaken out of unfounded fears.

छत्तेव्यश्चास्मि भेत्तव्यो दाह्यः पाटयोडप्यनेकशः
कल्पकोटीरसंख्येया न च बोधिर्भविष्यति ।।२१।।

21. For millions of countless ages I have been cut asunder, battered, burnt and flayed innumerable times. However, even that will not induce 'bodhi'.

Passing through the endless rounds of cyclic existence in hundreds of lives, one's only lot is suffering. One is liable to be cut asunder in hells where limbs are torn apart or severed; one may be battered, bruised or outright killed with weapons like maces and swords; one may be flayed with burning crochets and scalding tongs. This may happen for innumerable 'janamas' and even then bodhi may not be within one's reach. When such tortures constitute reward for unwholesome karma, why not happily face the tortures and rigours of the road to bodhi with courage by following the path of total self-abnegation as enunciated by Lord Buddha?

इंद तु मे परिमितं दुःखं संबोधिसाधनम्।
नष्टशल्यव्यथापोहे तदुत्पादनदुःखवत् ।२२।।

22. This suffering of mine for (the purpose of) perfect 'sambodhi' is limited like the pain of surgery one has to endure for removing a painful sore.

If there is a festering sore on the body it causes constant suffering and pain. In order to remove this permanent source of suffering, it has to be removed from the body through surgery. Just as that suffering for a limited span has to be endured in order to obviate recurring pain from the sore, so also it is essential to suffer for a limited period while striving for enlightenment or 'sambodhi' rather than go on constantly suffering in endless rounds of cyclic existence.

सर्वेऽपि वैद्याः कुर्वन्ति क्रियादुःखैररोगताम्।
तस्माद्बहूनि दुःखानि हन्तुं सोढव्यमल्पकम्।।२३।।
क्रियामिमामप्युचितां वर वैद्यो न दत्तवान्।
मधुरेणोपचारेण चिकित्सति महातुरान्।।२४।।

23-24. Most doctors effect cure through prescribing some bodily discormforts. So also, for destroying many and greater sufferings, it is good to endure a little suffering.

But the Supreme Physician did not suggest even these reasonable treatments or cures. He cures the most terrible pains with a very gentle treatment.

All doctors, while prescribing a cure, also suggest some

precautions which the patient has to observe, such as controlling one's diet, physical movements and smoking or taking chillies and spices, etc. So also, a lot of abstemiousness has to be practised while observing religious practices. The great diseases like lust, desire, avarice and hatred can only be cured through total self-control and by enduring a lot of apparent discomfort. A somewhat inconvinient austerity even has necessarily to be practised for curing illness which may, otherwise, completely spell ruin. However, the grace of the 'bhaishajya-guru' or the Lord of Physicians, Lord Buddha, saves one even from these minor discomforts, because he cures with a gentle treatment even such patients as are suffering from the chronic diseases of 'bhava-rōga', the ills of conditioned existence.

आदौ शाकादिदानेऽपि नियोजयति नायकः ।
तत् करोति क्रमात्पश्चाद्यत्स्वमांसान्यपि त्यजेत् ।।२५।।
यदा शाकेष्विव प्रज्ञा स्वमांसेऽप्युपजायते ।
मांसास्थि त्यजतस्तस्य तदा किं नाम दुष्क़रम् ।।२६।।

25-26. To start with, the Lord engages us (or encourages us) into giving away such things as food. Later, getting used to this routine, we may not hesitate from giving away even our flesh.

Afterwards, when a realisation is reached that one's flesh and bones are no different from vegetables or 'śāka', one feels no difficulty in giving away even one's flesh.

Charity or the giving away of food-stuffs like vegetables, barley flour, wheat or rice balls, etc, is the first step to which the Great Guide yokes us. Through this practice of charity, we gradually reach a stage of mental develop-

ment where all distinctions between our own flesh and limbs and food stuffs disappears when it comes to giving away one or the other. The cultivation of charity in material objects leads to the realization that our own body is also a charitable commodity and that it too can be sacrificed for the welfare of others. The feeling of non-attachment to material goods also generates a sense of non-attachment towards our own body. This is the road to the bodhisattva's goal of total self-effacement.

न दुःखी त्यक्तपापत्वात् पंडितत्वान्न दुर्मनाः ।
मिथ्याकल्पनया चित्ते पापात्काये यतो व्यथा ।।२७।।

27. There would be no suffering at giving up evil; there could be no confusion of mind from learning or knowledge. (But now my) mind is troubled due to false fancies as the body is due to evil actions (pāpa).

Suffering or duḳha is two-fold: 'kāyika' or physical and 'mānasika' or mental. Both are caused by illusory, non-existent causes. But, the bodhisattva is not touched by any of these dukhas. He is devoid of any 'vikār' or 'avidyā' i.e., deformity or defect in body; hence there is no physical pain for him. He has no mental pain either because he has realised 'nairātamya' (non-self) from both 'yukti' (logic) and 'āgama' (scriptures). The superimposition of imaginary concepts and fanciful coverings on the mind alone fills the mental world with illusions. The performance of physical violence also causes bodily pain. Therefore, if the physical and mental causes of dukha are eliminated, there will be no suffering.

पुण्येन कायः सुखितः पांडित्येन मनः सुखी ।
तिष्ठन् परार्थं संसारे कृपालुः केन खिद्यते।।२८।।

28. How can the Compassionate One feel sad, remaining as he does in samsara for others' sake and when his body is happy due to wholesome action and resultant merit and his mind happy due to wisdom.

Look at the earthly days of Lord Buddha. He roamed in our midst, dispensing compassion to all beings. He never felt any physical or mental dukha. He had, during the course of his hundreds of previous lives, gathered immense merit to give him bodily joy and immense wisdom to give him mental joy. The same is equally true of a bodhisattva whom no grief can ever touch for he is ever in a state of total bliss. He possesses 'kāyika' or physical happiness due to his 'punyas' and 'mānasika' or mental happiness due to his 'pānditya' or knowledge and wisdom.

क्षपयन् पूर्वपापानि प्रतीच्छन् पुण्यसागरान्।
बोधिचित्तबलादेव श्रावकेभ्योऽपि शीघ्रगः।।२९।।
एवं सुखात्सुखं गच्छन् को विषीदेत् सचेतनः।
बोधिचित्तरथं प्राप्य सर्वखेदश्रमापहम्।।३०।।

29-30. A bodhisattva consumes away his previous sins and garners oceans of merit on the strength of his bodhi-chitta. Therefore he is far ahead of the śrāvakas.

Who, of awakened mind, would feel despondent, going daily from joy to joy and attaining the chariot of bodhichitta which removes all sweat and fatigue?

The traveller of the bodhi-path travels faster on the Mahayana vehicle than on that of Śrāvakayāna. The chariot of bodhichitta is an immensely comfortable vehi-

cle and takes away all fatigue and sweat of the journey. The rider progresses from joy to joy everyday on the wings of acquired merit and bodhichitta.

छन्दस्थामरतिर्मुक्तिबलं सत्वार्थसिद्धये।
'छन्दं दुःखभयात्कुर्यादनुशंसाश्च भावयन्।।३१।।

31. For the welfare of all beings, the four-fold army of 'chhanda' (desire for meritorious deeds), 'sthāma' (courage in action), 'rati' (attachment to noble action) and 'mukti' (spirit of sacrifice) are essential. Engender 'chhanda' from the fear of dukha whilst pondering over the sweet fruits of noble action.

A person must possess a strong dispositon and desire for performing meritorious actions. A sense of joy and a tendency towards noble actions can be created by constantly fearing the consequences of evil karma and by reflecting over the sweet joys of noble conduct. This process will generate a state of healthy aspirations, conducive to the well-being of others. Courage to act good, passion for acting good and the spirit of self-abnegation are the three other wings of the four-fold moral force which can help create a fund of joy for all sattvas whose happiness alone is the bodhisattva's prime concern.

एवं विपक्षमुन्मूल्य यतेतोत्साहवृद्धये।
छन्दमानरतित्यागतात्पर्यवशिताबलै:।।३२।।

32. Thus one should, after uprooting the opposition, work hard for enhancing one's enthusiasm with the strength gained from wholesome aspirations, self-confidence, joy and the determination to get the desired result.

The 'vipakśa' or the opponents as referred to in this śloka comprise 'ālasya' or lethargy and similar shortcomings. Unless one overcomes their opposition, one can not fight the big foe — 'kleśas'. Just as one must, first of all, muster enough courage before one jumps into the battlefield to fight an enemy with the strength of one's armies, so also in the case of the enemy 'kleśas' it has to be fought against with the strength of courage and effort. How to generate 'chhanda-bala' or the power of acting meritoriously is explained in the next verse.

अप्रमेया मया दोषा हन्तव्याः स्वपरात्मनोः ।
एकैकस्यापि दोषस्य यत्र कल्पार्णवै : क्षय : ।।३३ ।।
तत्र दोषक्षयारम्भे लेशोऽपि मम नेक्ष्यते ।
अप्रमेयव्यथाभाज्ये नोरः स्फुटति मे कथम् ।।३४ ।।
गुणा मयार्जनीयाश्च बहवः स्वपरात्मनोः ।
तत्रैकैकगुणाभ्यासो भवेत्कल्पार्णवैर्न वा ।।३५ ।।

33-35. Innumerable are the faults-mine own and those of others — to be destroyed. The exhausting of each of these faults may even last oceans of ages.

Even an iota (of effort) is not perceivable to me for exhausting these faults or 'dośas'. Then, why does not my heart break away for my being the repository of immeasurable suffering?

Many excellent qualities have to be cultivated by me both for myself and for others' sake and the practising of each of the qualities severally may be possible only after aeons and not otherwise.

The purpose of human life is to accumulate merit and

exhaust previous evil. If the store of accumulated demerit is immeasurable, it may take hundreds of births to exhaust it. How is it that one does not shudder at this prospect, especially when one makes no effort at all to rectify even one fault and thus exhaust some of one's demerit. Many and immeasurable are the qualities needed to be cultivated for being able to do good to beings. The cultivation of each of these qualities may take ages to reach the stage of perfection. Hence, the task is not easy.

गुणलेशेऽपि नाभ्यासो मम जातः कदाचन।
वृथा नीतं मया जन्म कथंचिल्लब्धमद्भुतम्।।३६।।

36. I have never practised even a little of these excellent qualities. So I have wasted this inimitable life which came to me just by coincidence.

Human birth is a rare privilege. Its aim is the engendering of bodhichitta for the welfare of 'sattvas'. However, due to lethargy and lack of effort, one never starts on the path. How could then merit be earned? The rare opportunity afforded by human birth — as difficult as a tortoise trying to put his neck into the hole of a yoke being tossed over high seas — is thus wasted for nothing.

न प्राप्तं भगवत्पूजामहोत्सवसुखं मया।
न कृताः शासने कारा दरिद्राशा न पूरिता।।३७।।
भीतेभ्यो नाभयं दत्तमार्ता न सुखिनः कृताः।
दुःखाय केवलं मातुर्गतोऽस्मि गर्भशल्यताम्।।३८।।

37-38. I have not achieved the great joy of paying meet adoration to the Buddha; I have not worshipped the 'śāsana'; I have not fulfilled the wishes of the needy.

I have not bestowed fearlessness on those full of fear; I have not made the unhappy ones happy. Only for (giving) dukha (to her) was I born of my mother's womb.

Paying reverential adoration to Lord Buddha, worshipping iamges, stupas, reliquaries and other emblems of dharma, providing such facilities as that of 'vihara' or 'ārāma' (resting places) for sojourn, rest and sleep to monks or the sangha, giving charity to the needy and lessening their sufferings — these are some of the pre-requistes of noble conduct and normal routine laid down even for lay people. Fie on one who shirks even these! A person who cannot make efforts to reduce the fund of human suffering nor can ameliorate the lot of the needy, has been born in vain. For nothing did such a one inflict on his mother the travails of child-birth. His is a purposeless existence if not spent in religious pursuit.

धर्मच्छन्दवियोगेन पौर्विकेण ममाधुना।
विपत्तिरीदृशी जाता को धर्मेछन्दमुत्सृजेत्।।३९।।
कुशलानां च सर्वेषांछन्दं मूलं मुनिर्जगौ।
तस्यापि मूलं सततं विपाकफलभावना।।४०।।

39-40. So much suffering has accrued to me in previous life as well as in the present due to a lack of aspiration (chhanda) for dharma. Why should then one forsake this aspiration for dharma?

The Buddha himself said that 'chhanda' is the root of all meritorious pursuits. The root of that itself is the constant awareness about the ripening of the fruit of all action.

Joy in aspiration for dharma is at the root of noble

actions. All meritorious performance proceeds from a proclivity for dharma. This aspiration for dharma is generated by a reflection over and awareness of the fact that all action ripens into fruit and, therefore, noble action produces merit. The ability to discriminate between 'śubha' (good) and 'aśubha' (bad) or 'iśta' (noble) and aniśta' (ignoble) should be constantly exercised.

दुःखानि दौर्मनस्यानि भयानि विविधानि च।
अभिलाषविघाताश्च जायन्ते पापकारिणाम्।।४१।।
मनोरथः शुभकृतां यत्र यत्रैव गच्छति।
तत्र तत्रैव तत्पुण्यैः फलार्घेणाभिपूज्यते।।४२।।
पापकारिसुखेच्छा तु यत्र यत्रैव गच्छति।
तत्र तत्रैव तत्पापैर्दुःखशस्त्रैर्विहन्यते।।४३।।

41-43. Sufferings, mental unhappiness and fears of multifarious kinds as also the end of wholesome wishes are all born of evil actions.

Wheresoever the mental aim ('manoratha') of wholesome actions goes, it is worshipped and honoured with the desired fruit of that merit.

Howsoever and wherever the desire for joy proceeds after performing evil karma, there and then it is, as a consequence of evil actions, destroyed by the weapons of pain.

Unwholesome actions are the source of all suffering, physical as well as mental. They also destroy healthy and wholesome aspiration. Nobility of purpose is honoured everywhere and it generates sweet results. However, the desire for joy through evil karma will never bring forth

joy. The agents of dukha will smother all such desire for undeserved joy.

विपुलसुगन्धिशीतलसरोरुहगर्भगता
मधुरजिनस्वराशनकृतोपचितद्युतयः
मुनिकरबोधिताम्बुजविनिर्गतसद्वपुषः
सुगतसुता भवन्ति सुगतस्य पुरः कुशलैः । ।४४ । ।

44. The bodhisattavas are born in the presence of Sugata (Amitābha Buddha in Sukhāvati) in the womb of the spacious, fragrant and cool lotus through meritorious actions; their radiant bodies are nourished by the sweet speech of the conquerors, and the bodhisattva's glorious form in the lotus is made to bloom by the rays of light from Lord Buddha himself.

Having attained 'bhumīs' like 'pramuditā' etc. the bodhisattvas are born of a mother's womb of their own sweet will and for a purpose. They are conceived in the 'viśva-dala-kamala-kośa' of Buddha Amitabha's Sukhavati Heaven. That is why they are called the 'lotus-born' or 'sarorūha-garbha'. The lotuses, wherein they are conceived, are the givers of bliss and joy and are spacious, cool and fragrant and emanate sheer 'ānanda'. Staying in those lotuses the bodhisattvas take birth owing to their 'kuśala karma' and through the promptings of 'mahākarunā' and 'sambodhi'. The 'padamagarbha' bodhisattvas are of radiant bodies which are nourished by such food as the sweet words of dharma-teachings by the conquerors or Jinas. Their effulgent bodies spring forth from the lotus made to blossom or open up with the light from the rays issuing from Tathagata's 'urni-kośa' itself. Such bodhisattvas' bodies are complete and beautiful with all the auspicious marks ('lakśana-vyanjana-alamkrita'). In fact, they emanate from the very light that is

Lord Buddha himself, and it is their compassion for others that makes them reside in the prison of a mother's womb.

यमपुरुषापनीतसकलच्छविरार्तरवो ।
हुतवहतापविद्रुतकताम्रनिषिक्ततनुः ।
ज्वलदसिशक्तिघातशतशातितमांसदलः ।
पतति सुतप्ततलोहधरवीष्वशुभैर्बहुशः ।।४५।।

45. As a result of a lot of unwholesome conduct, a person falls on the fiercely blazing steel floors (of hell), wailing in extreme agony, his whole skin despoiled by the messengers of death, his entire frame drenched in liquid copper melted in a tremendous fire, his limbs ripped apart by blows of fiery swords and 'śaktis'.

Whereas the constant performance of meritorious actions leads to one's birth as a bodhisattva, the performance of evil actions hurls a person on to the red hot floors of burning hells again and again, where he is flayed alive in boiling cauldrons of molten copper or is torn limb by limb into mincemeat by the wielders of swords and lances. The messengers of hell allow him no respite from tortures. Several times, life after life he is consigned to these hells for long periods so that he is able to exhaust his evil karmas.

तस्मात् कार्यः शुभच्छंदो भावयित्वैवमादरात् ।
वज्रध्वजस्य विधिना मानं त्वारभ्य भावयेत् ।।४६।।

46. Therefore one should perform wholesome karma and aquaint oneself reverentially with it. One should start with confidence and with a

mind well-established in it as propounded in the Vajradhwaja-sutra.

After realising the difference between the fruits of noble and ignoble deeds, one must start on the path of practice with self-confidence. The mind should be firmly established in the objective and the attitude should not be lackaidaisical or flippant. The Vajradhwaja-sutra of Avatamsaka-sutra says: "For example, Deva-putra, when the sun shines forth it illuminates any suitable place without being turned back by such obstacles as blindness in people or uneven mountain formation. Likewise, when a bodhisattva shines forth for the şake of others, he ripens and liberates any suitable disciple and is not turned back by the various obstacles present in sentient beings."

The word 'māna' in this śloka means 'self-confidence', 'steadfastness'.

पूर्वं निरुप्य सामग्रीमारभेन्नारभेत वा।
अनारभ्भो वरं नाम न त्वारभ्य निवर्तनम्। ।४७।।
जन्मान्तरेऽपि सोऽभ्यासः पापाद् दुखं च वर्धते।
अन्यच्च कार्यकालं च हीनं तच्च न साधितम्। ।४८।।

47-48. One must first examine the available material before starting or not starting a practice. It is better not to start at all than to retreat (after starting once). Even in other lives this practice (of retreating) will only add to dukha brought about by evil action or 'pāpa'. It will weaken any other work undertaken during that period nor will the one already undertaken be accomplished.

At the outset one must thoroughly examine the mate-

rial at one's disposal for the execution of the desired aim. This is called 'kāran-sākalyama'. Only then one should finally decide whether or not to commence the work. If one possesses enough 'bala' or strength, one may start on the path. If 'bala' is lacking, it is futile to start at all. Better not to take to the path than to retrace steps midway. The habit of retreating weakens the mind and erodes the will. It diminishes the zeal for meritorious conduct and, consequently, lures one into unwholesome action which increases suffering. One can neither complete the job in hand nor undertake fresh leaps into other directions.

त्रिषु मानो विधातव्यः कर्मोपक्लेशशक्तिषु।
मयैवैकेन कर्तव्यमित्येषा कर्ममानिता।।४९।।
क्लेशास्वतन्त्रो लोकोऽयं न क्षमः स्वार्थसाधने।
तस्मान्मयैषां कर्तव्यं नाऽशक्तोऽहं यथा जनः।।५०।।

49-50. Self-confidence should be applied to three things: (wholesome) karma, minor 'kleśas' and capabīlity. 'I alone should perform it, — this is (called) the self-confidence of action.

This whole world is in bondage to kleśas and incapable of fulfilling its own will. Therefore, I should so conduct myself that I donot become as helpless as other persons.

Self-confidence means the belief in one's own capability to deliver the goods. This self-confidence must be applied in the performance of wholesome karma, in dealing with minor disturbing conceptions like jealousy etc. and in the application of one's capability or skill. Whereas the whole world functions under the subjugating power of 'kleśas', the one who cultivates bodhichitta can emancipate himself from their thraldom. He should

make himself capable of bearing the burden of all sentient beings and doing everything for their good. Such is the 'māna' or self-confidence of a bodhisattva.

नीचं कर्म करोत्यन्यः कथं मय्यपि तिष्ठति।
मानाच्चेन्न करोम्यैतन्मानो नश्यतु मे वरम्।।५१।।

51. Someone is doing inferior work when I am there. If, out of ego; I donot do that work, it will destroy my 'māna' or self-confidence.

He who undertakes bodhisattva vows must function as others' servant or 'dāsa'. He should not despise others for doing menial work nor hesitate to do that work himself. In fact, he as a practitioner of bodhisattva vows, should not let others do the inferior work but do it himself for them. If his ego stands in the way, he will only harm his own practice and his self-confidence will be damaged. Conversely, his 'māna' will increase if he undertakes to perform the meanest jobs for others' welfare.

मृतं दुष्डुभमासाद्य काकोऽपि गरुडायते।
आपदाबधतेऽल्पापि मनो मे यदि दुर्बलम्।।५२।।

52. Even a crow behaves like a 'garuda' when it encounters a dead snake. If my mind is weak, even the slightest difficulty will become a hurdle.

It is only the 'garuda' which can kill a live snake, but the sight of a dead snake makes even a crow behave as bold as a 'garuda'. Similarly, if a person lacks self-confidence and is weak of will, he will invite on himself the greedy looks of even all kinds of small failings. Even the

'upa-kleśas' will attack with fury like the crow attacking a dead snake. In the face of bigger 'kleśas', his lack of self-confidence will further decimate his will to fight.

विषादकृतनिश्चेष्टे आपदः सुकरा ननु।
व्युत्थितश्चेष्टमानस्तु महतामपि दुर्जयः।।५३।।

53. Obstacles come handy to one made immobile by grief, but to a person whose mind is elevated and who is industrious or persevering, even mighty hurdles are not insurmountable.

In the first case, it is a person who is weak of mind and body, is overcome by lassitude and is devoid of 'smriti'. He is, therefore, downcast and depressed. Even the slightest difficulty will unnerve him. In the second case, it is a person who, by dint of his 'smriti' and 'samprajanya' allows no elbow room to 'upa-kleśas'. He is strong of body and mind, firm of will and determined of purpose. He becomes invincible to any onslaught of even big obstacles.

तस्माद् दृढेन चित्तेन करोम्यापदमापदः।
त्रैलोक्यविजिगीषुत्वं हास्यमापज्जितस्य मे।।५४।।
मया हि सर्वं जेतव्यमहं जेयो न केनचित्।
मयैष मानो वोढव्यो जिनसिहंसुतो ह्यहम्।।५५।।

54-55. Therefore, with a determined mind, I will uproot all hurdles. (Otherwise) I am liable to become an object of ridicule, having had my aim as the conquest of the three worlds.

'All these have to be conquered by me and I shall not be conquered by them': Such

self-confidence has to be borne by me as the child of Jinas — the Lions.

The bodhisattva is destined to become the conqueror of the three worlds. Will not a person with bodhisattva vows become the laughing stock of every one if he is unable to overcome obstacles. He is like a lion-cub, being the son of the conquerors or Jinas. The conquerors wander about undeterred by the forces of 'māra', just as the lion saunters in the forest unafraid of any other presence around. The lion-cub too possesses the regal confidence of its father and knows no fear at all. The bodhisattva, as the lion-cub of the Jinas, must exhibit the same sense of fearlessness and courage in the pursuit of his vows.

ये सत्त्वा मानविजिता वराकास्ते न मानिनः ।
मानी शत्रुवशं नैति मानशत्रुवशाश्च ते ।।५६ ।।
मानेन दुर्गतिं नीता मानुष्येऽपि हतोत्सवाः ।
परिपिण्डाशिनो दासा मूर्खा दुर्दर्शनाः कृशाः ।।५७ ।।
सर्वतः परिभूताश्च मानस्तब्धास्तपस्विनः ।
तेऽपि चेन्मानिनां मध्ये दीनास्तु वद कीदृशा : ।।५८ ।।

56-58. Beings overcome by ego are reprehensible but certainly not persons with self-confidence. A person of self-confidence never surrenders to the foe; (whereas) others are in the clutches of the foe called 'māna' or ego.

Led into lower realms by their (foolish) ego, they become bereft of joy even in human existence. They are like slaves eating food from others' hands; fools, weak of body and detestable to sight.

Disregarded at all places, made obdurate by

self-conceit, bloated fools, — they too are counted among the egoists; then, what (to speak) of the other down and out people?

Ego or 'ahamkāra' is the worst foe of man. If a person once comes under its strangle-hold, there is no escape for him. The practice of ego leads him to lower births and deprives him of all joy even in a human birth, because, even in that existence, he will work as a servile slave or a servant or as a beggar living on charity and also suffer from physical and mental deficiencies. Thus, even his human existence will become a living hell for him. When even well-meaning practitioners get deviated from the path due to the 'dośa' of 'ahamkāra' what to speak of the common people. And then, who will practise compassion on them? Therefore, it is essential to cultivate self-confidence, to renounce self-importance, conceit and ego.

ते मानिनो विजयिनश्च त एव शूरा।
ये मानशत्रुविजयाय वहन्ति मानम्।
ये तं स्फुरन्तमपि मानरिपुंनिहत्य।
कामं जने जयफलं प्रतिपादयन्ति।।५९।।
संक्लेशपक्षमध्यस्थो भवेद्दृप्तः सहस्रशः।
दुर्योधनः क्लेशगणैः सिंहो मृगगणैरवि।।६०।।

59-60. They alone are self-confident, victorious and valiant who possess their self-confidence in order to conquer the enemy called self-conceit. They alone destroy this fire of self-conceit even as it is raising its head and thus fulfil the wishes of the people (at large) and bring the fruit of victory to themselves.

Even staying in the midst of a host of 'kleśas', one should remain armed (with

self-confidence) in a thousand ways; one should be invincible like the lion in the midst of a pack of deer.

Only self-confidence can destroy self-conceit. Ego should never be allowed to raise its ugly head. One's self-confidence should be so strong that no amount of disturbing conceptions should be able to unnerve it or deplete its resources. Self-confidence is the strongest weapon in a sādhaka's armoury. Armed with self-confidence, he can roam fearlessly like the king of the jungle who is never disturbed by the presence of so many puny deer around him.

महत्स्वपि हि कृच्छ्रेषु न रसं चक्षुरीक्षते।
एवं कृच्छ्रमपिं प्राप्य न क्लेशवशगो भवेत्।।६१।।

61. Even in times of extreme suffering the eye does not see (i.e. experience) the 'rasa' or taste. So also a person should not be overcome by 'kleśas' even in times of misery.

The eye always remains untouched by 'vishayas' or the tastes of sense organs like the sweetness or pungency experienced by the tongue. Even in moments of extreme agony, it remains devoid of such 'rasas'. Likewise should be a person's attitude towards 'kleśas'. He should not succumb to their 'rasa' or taste or be overpowered by their influence under any circumstances. That alone could spell for valour coupled with self-confidence, enabling him to conquer dukha'.

यदेवापद्यते कर्म तत्कर्मव्यसनी भवेन्।
तत्कर्मशौण्डो ऽतृप्तात्मा क्रीडाफलसुखेप्सुवत्।।६२।।

सुखार्थं क्रियते कर्म तथापि स्यान्न वा सुखम्।
कर्मैव तु सुखं यस्य निष्कर्मा स सुखी कथम्।।६३।।

62-63. Whatever karma or action devolves on him, one should become devoted (or addicted) to that itself like a person desirous of the fruit of a game (in gambling) — ever-addicted, ever-insatiate.

Action is performed for the sake of happiness, but even then there may be no happiness. However, he for whom work itself is happiness, how can he be happy without work?

He who has taken to the bodhi 'mārga' should gladly perform any work that may be assigned to him. His commitment to his work should be total like that of a gambler who is completely addicted to the game for its own sake as well as its profit aspect. Whereas the achievement of happiness is the object of all human activity, it may still elude them and the result would be misery. But, if work is considered its own reward, its own joy, there will be no ground for unhappiness whatever the circumstances. Hence, a bodhisattva, for whom work itself is joy, will always be busy with karma or action; inaction will not touch him.

कामैर्न तृप्तिः संसारे क्षुरधारामधूपमैः।
पुण्यामृतैः कथं तृप्तिर्विपाकमधुरैः शिवैः।।६४।।

64. If sensual desires, which are like a honey-smeared razor's edge, cannot give satiety, why should, then, a person be satiated with the nectar of meritorious deeds, — sweet in their consequence and beneficial.

Sensual desires are like a sharp-edged blade coated with honey. After licking that honey, the greedy person hankering after further enjoyment, is likely to cut his tongue itself. So, the joys of the material senses in 'sàm-sāra' are brief and superficial. If a person's sensual joys are insatiable, even though they are dangerous and fleeting, why should he not go after the joys of 'punya' or meritorious actions which are perennially sweet. Why should not his desire for these be also insatiable? How does he think that only a little 'punya' will do? The nectar of virtuous action is 'madhur' or sweet because its fruit is the welfare of beings; it is 'śiva' or beneficial because it is of immense good to all and removes suffering.

तस्मात्कर्मावसानेऽपि निमज्जेतत्र कर्मणि।
यथा मध्याह्नसंतप्त आदौ प्राप्तसराः करी।।६५।।
बलऩाशानुबन्धे तु पुनः कर्तुं परित्यजेत्।
सुसमाप्तं तु तन्मुञ्चेदुत्तरोत्तरतृष्णया।।६५।।

65-66. Therefore, even after the cessation of a (previously commenced) action, one should plunge oneself into action just as an elephant, tormented by the mid-day sun, at once plunges into a lake as soon as he reaches it.

When there is a decline in strength, one should leave (the work) at that (for a while) in order to complete it later When it is well accomplished, it should be laid aside with the desire to accomplish what may further follow.

The surest way to ward off the agonising heat of 'kleśas' is to plunge into the cool and refreshing waters of action or karma. It may be that sometimes one feels

depleted of 'bala' or strength to complete the task in hand. In a situation like that one may let go the task for a while, recuperate one's strength, and again plunge into it with renewed vigour. Once the task in hand is completed, one should not just rest on one's oars but keep oneself in readiness for further activity. Ceaseless action is the key to the goal.

क्लेशप्रहारान् संरक्षेत् क्लेशांश्च प्रहरेद्दृढम्।
खड्गयुद्धमिवापन्नः शिक्षितेनारिणा सह।।६७।।
तत्र खड्गं यथा भ्रष्टं गृहणीयात्सभयस्त्वरन्।
स्मृतिखड्गं तथा भ्रष्टं गृहणीयान्नरकान् स्मरन्।।६८।।

67-68. One should ward off the onslaughts of 'kleśas' and destroy them with a strong blow as one does in a sword fight against a well-trained foe.

There, (i.e. in a fight) if one were to drop one's sword, one immediately takes it up again out of fear. So also, for fear of hells, one should immediately retrieve the sword of 'smriti' or mindfulness if it falls down (from one's hand).

Disturbing conceptions are like a skilled adversary who can only be routed by a stronger and better-skilled opponent. Hence one must give them a tough fight, never yield but battle with greater ferocity after retrieving one's sword in case it falls down from one's hand. In a battle with a human enemy, one is terribly frightened when one becomes weaponless and one immediately tries to re-arm oneself. In the case of the unseen enemy, 'kleśas', surrender or defeat would mean a straight passage to hells. Hence, in order to obviate this risk, one must never

let go the weapon of mindfulness so that one can give a determined battle to the foe.

विषं रुधिरमासाद्य प्रसर्पति यथा तनौ।
तथैव छिद्रमासाद्य दोषश्चित्ते प्रसर्पति।।६९।।
तैलपात्रधरो यद्वदसिहस्तैरधिष्ठितः।
स्खलिते मरणत्रासात्तत्परः स्यात् तथा व्रती।।७०।।

69-70. Just as poison, after entering the blood, spreads fast in the body, so also a little fault ('dośa') or 'kleśas'-incision will permeate the whole mind.

A practitioner (or a person with vows) should be as vigilant as a person carrying a jar of mustard oil under the supervision of swordsmen and he will slip only on pain of death.

'Kleśas' are racier than the raciest of poisons. If the littlest of them is given a quarter it will completely take hold of the mind just as once it enters the blood stream, poison spreads in the whole body. Therefore the seeker has to be very cautious and vigilant. Think of a person carrying a jar of oil escorted by sword-wielding king's men on either side. He walks with carefully measured steps lest he stumble or slip and spill the oil for which lapse the swordsmen are authorised to cut off his head. With the situation he is in, there is no room for laxity. Such is the vigilance required of a 'vrati', a seeker who has taken the 'vratas' or vows.

तस्मादुत्संगगे सर्पे यथोत्तिष्ठति सत्वरम्।
निद्रालस्यागमे तद्वत्प्रतिकुर्वीत सत्वरम्।।७१।।

एकैकस्मिंश्छले सुष्ठु परितप्य विचिन्तयेत्।
कथं करोमि येनेदं पुनर्मे न भवेदिति।।७२।।

71-72. Just as a person would swiftly get up if a snake gets on to his lap, so should one react when sleep and lethargy overtake him.

At every deviation or faltering one should ponder in the mind again and again: 'Oh, what shall I do so that this does not happen to me again?'

Vigilance and mindfulness should not be given up at any stage. How quick is the reaction of a person when he suddenly finds a snake in his lap! For fear of being bitten, he at once hurls it away with all the speed at his command. One should shake off lassitude in the same manner otherwise its bite will simply enervate both the body and the mind. Whenever one falters on the path one must reflect in the mind as to how and why he slipped, where he erred and how a repetition of the lapse could be avoided.

संसर्गं कर्म वा प्राप्तुमिच्छेदेतेन हेतुना।
कथं नामास्ववस्थासु स्मृत्यभ्यासो भवेदिति।।७३।।

73. One should aspire to seek the proximity to teachers ('gurus') and accomplish (what they teach) for the purpose of practising 'smriti' or mindfulness in such circumstance (i.e. in the face of kleśas).

In order that one may learn the art of practising mindfulness in the face of a host of disturbing conceptions, one must seek the company of well-known teachers, pre-

ceptors and 'brahmachāriṣ' who are proficient in the lore of the Tripitakas. One should aspire to learn their teachings about the removal of obstacles and the eradication of the influence of kleśas. One must learn from them proper action and noble conduct through the study of Sutra.

लघुं कुर्यात्तथात्मानमप्रमादकथां स्मरन्।
कर्मागमाद्यथा पूर्वं सज्जः सर्वत्र वर्तते।।७४।।

74. Remembering the dissertation on 'apramada' or alertness, one should prepare oneself in a determined manner just as, prior to confrontation with a task, one makes alround preparations to cope with it.

'Pramāda' or lethargy is a great drawback. In order that one may advance in life, one must give up sloth and recollect the teachings on 'apramāda' or alterness and practise studious application to one's task. A determined effort alone will enable one tread the path of religious practice.

यथैव तूलकं वायोर्गमनागमने वशम्।
तथोत्साहवशं यायाद् ऋद्धिश्चैवं समृध्यति।।७५।।

75. Just as (the movement of) a cotton piece is dependent on the blowing of the wind (back and forth), so also, dependent on courage or self-reliance, perfection (like 'riddhīs') can be accomplished.

A cotton flake moves and dangles back and forth as the wind may move it. So does a person's progress back

and forth depend on the motive force of courage and self-confidence which he may bring to bear on his performance. Self-confidence leads to effort or 'veerya' and, through the practice of 'veerya', one can attain all 'riddhis' or perfections like astral flying or 'akāśagamanama' etc.

VIII – Dhyāna-Pārmitā

PERFECTION OF MEDITATION

वर्धयित्वैवमुत्साहं समाधौ स्थापयेन्मनः ।
विक्षिप्तचित्तस्तु नरः क्लेशदंष्ट्रान्तरे स्थितः ।।१ ।।

1. Having thus developed 'utsāha' or courage, one should fix one's mind in samādhi', because a person with an unstable mind is a person stuck between the fangs of 'kleśas'.

After cultivating the courage of self-confidence and fortifying effort with zeal in the manner explained heretofore a person should concentrate his mind in 'samadhi' through meditation. If he gets lost in lethargy and flippancy, he only exposes himself to a concerted attack from disturbing conceptions. In fact, he is as if seated in between the sharp jaws of this beast called 'kleśa'. One pointed-ness or 'ekāgrata' is absolutely essential for 'samādhi', which is a state of absolute mental stability. Concentrating the mind on 'punya-karma' by and by, a person can increase the duration of concentration by giving up 'ālasya' or lassitude and thus enter the realm of subtle thought or 'sukshma bhāva'. However, first and foremost, the mind has to be stabalised. Only a still and stable mind unaffected by disturbing conceptions can concentrate on 'punya karma', The development of mental tranquillity with concentration is accompanied by three benefits, happiness in the present life, a favourable rebirth in the next and a freedom from mental defilements.

कायचित्तविवेकेन विक्षेपस्य न संभवः।
तस्माल्लोकं परित्यज्य वितर्कान् परिवर्जयेत्।।२।।

2. Through detachment of body and mind no distraction can occur. Therefore, after forsaking wordly attachments, one should give up distractions.

How is bodily attachment given up? By giving up contact and relationship with others. It is called 'janasamparka-vivarjanatā'. How is mental attachment given up? By giving up desires. This is called 'kāmādi-vitarka-vivarjanatā'. A person who practises this two-fold detachment can never deviate form the path. Hence one must renounce all wordly attachments like relatives and friends who alone distract the mind form higher pursuit. When these sources of physical and mental distractions are removed, the mind will become stable. Samadhi can be practised only when the mind does not wander but concentrates on a single object or idea. Dullness and instability of the mind are two of the biggest impediments in practising 'dhyāna' or meditation. The mind can be stabilized by making it reflect on 'anityatā' and 'durgati', i.e. transitoriness and damnation. This will discourage it from dabbling into frivolities of life. The mind can be activated by making it reflect on the joys of bodhichitta and of refuge in the 'tri-ratna'.

स्नेहान्न त्यज्यते लोको लाभादिषु च तृष्णया।
तस्मादेतत्परित्यागे विद्वानेवं विभावयेत्।।३।।

3. One is unable to forsake wordly relationships due to attachment and a desire for material gains. Therefore, in renouncing these things, the wise person should so function (that he is able to give them up).

Love amounting to infatuation for one's relatives and friends does not allow a person to leave them. This is 'moha'. Also, there is the desire for wealth and fame and material comforts. This keeps a person tied to the apron strings of dame life. This is called 'lābha'. However, a person who is intelligent enough to know the distinction between attachment and renunciation will certainly be able to practise detachment and function accordingly in his day-to-day conduct.

शमथेन विपश्यनासुयुक्तः कुरुते क्लेशविनाशमित्यवेत्य ।
शमथः प्रथमं गवेषणीयः स च लोके निरपेक्षयाभिरत्या । ।४ । ।

4. Possesing 'vipaśyanā' or deep insight for the sake of mental concentration, and realising that the removal of kleśas is essential, the practitioner seeks mental concentration first of all. This (i.e. śamatha) is attained through the genuine joy desired from non attachment.

In order to achieve worldly and transcendental absorptions, one has to first develop calm and insight, i.e. 'śamatha' and vipaśyanā'. The aspect of collectedness or 'samādhi' which pacifies the fickleness of the mind is called 'śamatha' or calm. Whilst that wisdom which can penetrate with the three marks of existence-impermanence, unsatisfactoriness and non-self-soul is called 'vipaśayanā' or deep insight, 'Śamatha' is called 'chittaikāgralakshnāh-samādhi' or a state of mental concentration. And, 'vipaśayana' is called 'yathā-bhūta-tattva-parijnānsvabhāvāh prajnā' or that wisdom which knows the reality of all phenomena. However, the first thing to be cultivated is 'śamatha' or mental calm through taking the mind off earthly attachments. Once the mind is well-established in calm, analytical faculties, through examining things mentally, it produces an incisive insight. 'Śamatha' is

compared to a deep, calm and serene pond in which the fish of 'vipaśayanā' moves in examination of its surrounding world. Hence he alone who possesses deep insight along with calm can destroy kleśas!

कस्यानित्येष्वनित्यस्य स्नेहो भवितुमर्हति।
येन जन्म सहस्राणि द्रष्टव्यो न पुनः प्रियः।।५।।

5-6. Why should a transitory being desire to have attachment for transitory objects for he will not be able to see them (i.e. his near and dear ones) for thousands of lives.

अपश्यन्नरतिं याति समाधौ न च तिष्ठति।
न च तृप्यति दृष्टवापि पूर्ववद् बाध्यते तृषा।।६।।

Not seeing them, one becomes unhappy and one is unable to concentrate (in meditation). Seeing them even, there is no satiety and the longing (to see) increases as before.

What is it that makes an 'anitya' infatuated with the 'anitya'. One loves one's wife, children, relatives and friends knowing well that all of them, like himself, are transitory beings and that, during the course of thousands of future lives, one may never meet those faces again. When they are in sight, the longing to be with them longer continues unabated. When they are out of sight the craving to be with them is acute. Thus, in both cases, there is only craving and no satiety. This disaffection, born of attachment, is a great obstacle in meditation and concentration.

न पश्यति यथाभूतं संवेगादवहीयते।
दह्यते तेन शोकेन प्रियसंगमकांक्षया।।७।।

7-8. One does not see the reality of beings and, desirous of the sight of his dear ones, he is constantly consumed by sorrow.

तच्चिन्तया मुधा याति ह्रस्वमायुर्मुहुर्मुहुः।
अशाश्वतेन धर्मेण धर्मो भ्रश्यति शाश्वतः।।८।।

Grieving for them, life ebbs away without a purpose moment by moment. The dharma which is perennial is destroyed for the sake of that which is fleeting.

Earthly attachment does not allow a person to see the true nature of things nor the distinction between good and evil. He little realises that the objects of his longing and love are impermanent creatures. In vain does he grieve in separation from them, in vain does he pine for their company. The brief span of life granted to him passes away by and by; his 'samskāras' to perform wholesome karma get depleted gradually and he is unable to collect sufficient merit. The dear ones for whose love he has wasted his precious years are not 'sthira' or permanent but 'anitya' or impermanent like himself. He has wasted the chance to practise dharma within a life which has just gone waste. Thus he barters away a permanent thing — dharma, for a fleeting thing — his kith and kin.

बालैः सभागचरितो नियतं याति दुर्गतिम्।
नेष्यते विषभागश्च किं प्राप्तं बालसंगमात्।।९।।

9-10. Verily does a person go to lower realms by acting foolishly. The society of the foolish is not desireable. What gain is had from their kinship?

क्षणाद् भवन्ति सुहृदो भवन्ति रिपवः क्षणात्।
तोषस्थाने प्रकुप्यन्ति दुराराध्याः पृथग्जनाः ।।१०।।

One moment they are friends; the next moment they are foes. They get (sometimes) angry even when they should be happy. It is very difficult to please ordinary beings.

A practitioner of the dharma cannot afford to behave like 'prathagjanāh' or ordinary, vulgar people who are not committed to any vows or who are 'anārya', un-Aryan or ignoble. He will gain nothing from their society, because they are frivolous, flippant and unreliable. They can be friend and foe in the same breath. Their outlook is narrow and it is well-nigh impossible to always keep them in good humour.

हितमुक्ताः प्रकुप्यन्ति वारयन्ति च मां हितात्।
अथ न श्रूयते तेषां कुपिता यान्ति दुर्गतिम्।।११।।

11-14. Anything said for their benefit annoys them and they deprive me also of benefit. If they are not listened to, they get angry and attain 'durgati' or damnation (to hells).

ईर्ष्योत्कृष्टात्समाद्वन्दवो हीनान्मानः स्तुतेर्मदः।
अवर्णात्प्रतिघश्चेति कदा बालाद्धितं भवेत्।।१२।।

Thus as the association with such vulgar people will bring great misfortune, I shall function alone in solitude without mental agony.

आत्मोत्कर्षः परावर्णः संसाररतिसंकथा ।
इत्याद्यवश्यमशुभं किंचिद्बालस्यबालतः ।।१३ ।।

They are jealous of superiors, discriminate against equals, insulting towards inferiors, conceited when praised and angry when their shortcomings are enumerated. What benefits could be desired from these vulgar persons.

एवं तस्यापि तत्संगात् तेनानर्थसमागमः ।
एकाकी विहरिष्यामि सुखमक्लिष्टमानसः ।।१४ ।।

So, something harmful is bound to be the result of associating with vulgar people, such as selfpraise, bringing to light others' faults, delight in the joys of 'samsāra' and dilating on these alone.

Now, 'Śāntideva enumerates some of the basic foibles of common people. These are anger, jealousy, ego, self-praise, contemptuosness towards inferiors and intolerance towards others etc. Their proximity can confer no benefit and, as such, they should be pitied and shunned. This will keep a person away from mental defilements and add to his fund of mental happiness. It is, therefore, wise to function in solitude treading the path of unattached, righteous conduct for the benefit of beings.

बालाद्दूरं पलायेत प्राप्तमाराधयेत्प्रियैः ।
न संस्तवानुबन्धेन किन्तूदासीन साधुवत् ।।१५ ।।

One should flee away from the foolish vulgar. (However), if one does chance upon them one

should please them with sweet gestures but with the indifference of the noble-minded (sādhu').

धर्मार्थमात्रमादाय भृङ्गवत् कुसुमान्मधुः ।
अपूर्व इव सर्वत्र विहरिष्याम्यसंस्तुतः ।।१६।।

Like a bee taking honey from flowers only to the extent it needs for her holy purpose, I shall roam everywhere as an unknown stranger like the new moon.

लाभी च सत्कृतश्चाहमिच्छन्ति बहवश्च माम् ।
इति मर्त्यस्य संप्राप्तान्मरणाज्जायते भयम् ।।१७।।

'I have many possessions, I am honoured by people, many adore me, '— such a person is suddenly overtaken by fear when confronted with death.

One should have no links or attachment with the vulgar except to the extent one can serve the objects of dharma. Then, one should speak to them gently about noble conduct and righteousness but should not get involved with them in any controversy; one should remain totally detached and indifferent like a recluse. The bee sucks honey and flits from flower to flower and does not get attached to any of the flowers. So should the seeker be devoid of all attachment but receiving and giving sweetness and light from and to all. The possession of 'cheevar' etc, or for that matter any material goods, the conceit of being respected and honoured by others, these create a sense of false belonging and, at the hour of death, frighten a person with the prospect of being dispossessed of all these things. Hence all attachment to such things must be avoided.

यत्र यत्र रतिं याति मनः सुखविमोहितम्।
तत्तत् सहस्त्रगुणितम् दुःखं भूत्वोपतिष्ठति।।१८।।

18-22. Wheresoever the mind gets attached, under the delusion of happiness, a thousand-fold dukha will accrue to stay with it.

तस्मात्प्रज्ञो न तामिच्छेद् इच्छातो जायते भयम्।
स्वयमेव च यात्येतद् धैर्यं कृत्वा प्रतीक्षताम्।।१९।।

Hence the wise should not hanker after them, because desires generate, fear. These go away by themselves if one waits with fortitude.

बहवो लाभिनोऽभूवन् बहवश्च यशस्विनः।
सहलाभयशोभिस्ते न ज्ञाताः क्व गता इति।।२०।।

Innumerable were the persons who made (material) gains and also earned fame. However, it is not known as to where all of them went away along with their gain and glory.

मामेवान्ये जुगुप्स्यन्ति किं प्रहृष्याम्यहं स्तुतः।
मामेवान्ये प्रशंसन्ति किं विषीदामि निन्दितः।।२१।।

Others hate me, why should I feel happy when praised? Others praise me, why should I feel pained when reviled.?

नानाधिमुक्तिकाः सत्वा जिनैरपि न तोषिताः।
किं पुनर्मादृशैरज्ञैस्तस्मात्किं लोकचिन्तया।।२२।।

Even the jinas could not please people with varying inclinations. What, then, of ignorant fools like me? Why bother about (pleasing) the world?

All wordly joys are delusive in the ultimate analysis and spell for the generation of immense suffering in the long run. No sane person should run after material joys. Their possession itself creates fear lest one is deprived of them. If one has courage, patience and fortitude, their temporary lure fades away as they are absolutely ephemral in content. Think of the numberless people who are reputed to have amassed great possessions and earned name and fame in their lifetimes. Could these save them from death or accompany them after death to the next birth? Certainly not. It is difficult to please the whole world. Even the great conquerors could not do it. How can, then, a puny being earn the good will of all? Therefore, instead of trying to pursue material ambitions and pleasing the world, one should practise dharma and collect 'punya'.

निन्दन्त्यलाभिनं सत्त्वमवध्यायन्ति लाभिनम्।
प्रकृत्या दुःखसंवासैः कथं तैर्जायते रतिः ।।२३।।

23. People speak ill of a person without (material) gains and scorn one with (material gains). How can these, by nature· prone to living in the company of 'dukha', evėr produce joy?

Generally, evil tongues do it both ways; they run down a person for being materially poor and also criticise him who is materially affluent. In the former case their criticism is born of ridicule, in the latter case it is born of jealousy as to how he alone is deserving of such comforts. Hence, these vulgar people are always destined to live in

suffering as a consequence of their narrow outlook. What joy could be there in friendship with such people?

न बालः कस्य चिन्मित्रमिति चोक्तं तथागतैः।
न स्वार्थेन विना प्रीतिर्यस्माद् बालस्य जायते।।२४।।

24-29. The Tathagatas have said that the worldly people are nobody's friends, because a worldly being's love cannot but be born of selfishness.

स्वार्थद्वारेण या प्रीतिरात्मार्थं प्रीतिरेव सा।
द्रव्यनाशे यथोद्वेगः सुखहानिकृतो हि सः।।२५।।

Love that is born of selfishness is a joy for personal ends alone. As the loss of material wealth produces pain so it confers loss of joy also.

नावध्यायन्ति तरवो न चाराध्याः प्रयत्नतः।
कदा तैः सुखसंवासैः सह वासो भवेन्मम।२६।।

The trees do not speak harsh words nor can they be pleased with artifice (i.e. with sweet words etc.). When shall I have the opportunity to dwell with those happy-to-live-with trees?

शून्यदेवकुले स्थित्वा वृक्षमूले गुहासु वा।
कदानपेक्षो यास्यामि पृष्टतोऽतवलोकयन्।।२७।।

When shall I, in complete detachment and

without looking back, resort to solitary temples or stay at the foot of trees or in caves.?

अममेषु प्रदेशेषु विस्तीर्णेषु स्वभावतः ।
स्वच्छन्दचार्यनिलयो विहरिष्याम्यहं कदा ।।२८।।

When shall I roam about, unfettered and homeless in outlandish places which, by themselves, are vast and open?

मृत्पात्रमात्रविभवश्चौरासंभोगचीवरः ।
निर्भयो विहरिष्यामि कदा कायमगोपयन् ।।२९।।

With just an earthen begging bowl as my wealth and clothes which no thief would wish to steal away, — fearless, without even the need to cover my body; — when shall I roam about like this?

A sadhak should look for the pristine solitude of an ancient temple or a cave, or a tree or a forest, where he can roam unhindered or sit meditating in total absorption. Detached from all wordly distractions, he will be able to concentrate on his goal. He will not be encumbered with any material possessions except the minimum for his needs like the begging bowl, a small jug ('kamandalu') and his rags. He need not fear thieves for he will have nothing to tempt them. It is said of Milarepa that thieves once entered his cave and were completely disappointed to find nothing worth stealing there. The yogi accosted them with bold words. "When I don't find anything here during day how can you find anything at night?."

कायभूमिं निजां गत्वा कंकालैरपरैः सह।
स्वकायं तुलयिष्यामि कदा शतनधर्मिणम्।।३०।।

30-32. Resorting to a cremation ground, when shall I compare my own body with those others there to realise (that there is no big difference).

अयमेव हि कायो मे एवं पूतिर्भविष्यति।
शृगाला अपि यद्गन्धान्नोपसर्पेयुरन्तिकम्।।३१।।

This very body of mine will become so decadent that, owing to its horrible stench, not even jackals will approach anywhere near it.

अस्यैकस्यापि कायस्य सहजा अस्थिखंडकाः।
पृथक् पृथक् गमिष्यन्ति किमुतान्यः प्रियो जनः।।३२।।

Of this whole frame, the bones can easily be broken apart. Then, why will not (similar) bodies of dear ones (or friends and relatives) will (similarly) fall apart?

One of the recognised 'sadhanās' with yogis is 'śamaśāna-sādhanā', i.e. living in a cremation ground and practising perfection by comparing one's own body to those others cremated there, and arriving at the conclusion that, in the final analysis, there is no big difference between the one and the others. The cremation ground is the ultimate retreat of all bodies. This generates a purifying and ennobling influence on the mind of the practitioner. When one compares one's own body with those of the dead, one also realises that the same fate is in store for the bodies of his near and dear ones. This realisation

exercises a very salutary effect and gives rise to detachment.

एक उत्पद्यते जन्तुर्म्रियते चैक एव हि।
नान्यस्य तद्वयथाभागः किं प्रियैर्विघ्नकारकैः।।३३।।

A being is born alone and dies alone; none else shares the pain with him. What use are, then, dear or beloved ones who are mere hurdles (in the path)?

Birth and death are two of the most significant events. These stand apart by themselves as, on these two occasions, none shares one's suffering. It is only during the interim span of life that friends and relatives may share one's joys and sorrows. At death, one departs alone. Only one's 'punya karma' comes to one's rescue when all beloved ones desert. Hence, why have so much concern for them? In fact, they act as great obstacles in the path of 'punya-sambhāra' or accumulation of merit.

अध्वानं प्रतिपन्नस्य यथावासपरिग्रहः।
तथा भवाध्वगस्यापि जन्मावासपरिग्रहः।।३४।।

34. Like a wayfarer on a road sojourning (temporarily) in an inn, is the fate of the wayfarer on the road of life who has to leave this inn of a life (for the next).

One birth is a brief interval in a long, long journey. It is like a halting place en-route. As the weary travellar settles down for a brief night-halt in a 'mandapa' or an inn he knows he is to continue his labours the next day and that he should not get engrossed with the luxurious comforts of the inn itself. So is the case with human life. It is

a place of temporary sojourn, its comforts and allurements, notwithstanding. Life's journey over, the travellar has to quit the inn.

चतुर्भिः पुरुषैर्यावत्स न निर्धार्यते ततः ।
आशोच्यमानो लोकेन तावदेव वनं व्रजेत् ।।३५।।

35-37. One should, as it is, go to the forest and not wait for the time of four pall-bearers, in the midst of cries of grief, to renounce the world.

असंस्तवाविरोधाभ्यामेक एव शरीरकः ।
पूर्वमेव मृतो लोके म्रियमाणो न शोचति ।।३६।।

Praised by none and reviled by none, a person detached and alone, does not grieve at the time of death, for he is already dead (to praise and blame) when alive.

न चान्तिकचराः केचिच्छोचन्तः कुर्वते व्यथाम्
बुद्धाद्यनुस्मृतिं चास्य विक्षिपन्ति न केचन ।।३७।।

Neither can (such a being's) near ones cause him any suffering through their expressions of grief nor can they distract him from his recollection of Buddha and the dharma (as props for the mind).

Renunciation must be practised now and here when one is alive and kicking in life. It should not be postponed till the last. It won't be long when death comes knocking at the door and the beloved ones start wailing

with grief and the four pall-bearers wait for the pier to be ready. One should not wait for renunciation till that hour of unwilling, tearful leave-taking when cries of 'o son', 'o dear one' are rending the air. Why not resort to the forest early and practise detachment?

A being who practises detachment is not affected by praise or blame. He is totally impervious, nay dead, to such wordly attributes of fame and ill-fame. Therefore, death holds no terror for him; he is already dead to wordly attachments. Having drawn himself away from his family, friends and home, he is untouched by the vagaries of cyclic existence. So he is 'pūravameva mrta-lokay' i.e. already dead in the world.

To a man of detachment, death comes in a happy and peaceful manner. Living in the forest, away from the din of friends and relatives, he passes into the next life, reflecting on the noble teachings of Lord Buddha and of dharma, thus gathering 'punya' for his next life.

तस्मादेकाकिता रम्या निरायासा शिवोदया।
सर्वविक्षेपसमनी सेवितव्या सदा मया।।३८।।

38-40. Therefore, solitude, which gives joys, is trouble-free and beneficent and sets at rest all disturbances, should always be practised by me.

सर्वान्यचिन्तानिर्मुक्तः स्वचित्तैकाग्रमानसः।
समाधानाय चित्तस्य प्रयतिष्ये दमाय च।।३९।।

Free from all other worries and my mind concentrated in one-pointedness, I shall endeavour for its equipoise and restraint.

कामा ह्यनर्थजनका इह लोके परत्र च।
इह बन्धवधोच्छेदैर्नरकादौ परत्र च।।४०।।

Desires alone are the progenitors of all 'anartha' or evil in this world and the next, in this through bondage, muders and tortures, and in the next through hell etc.

Many are the blessings which solitude or 'anasangavihāritā' confers. It produces unalloyed joy and eradicates all distrations of body, speech and mind. Thus the mind gains complete equipoise and serenity, unaffected by 'kleśas'. When the mind becomes staid, 'dhyāna' becomes easy. When all desires vanish, peace alone prevails, for desires alone are the root of suffering here and hereafter. All mutual bickerings and qurrels, killings, mudrers etc. are the fruits of unbridled desire or kāma'. These desires are responsible for condemning a person to lower realms in his next life.

यदर्थं दूतदूतीनां कृतांजलिरनेकधा।
न च पापमकीर्तिर्वा यदर्थं गणिता पुरा।।४१।।

41-47. They (i.e. women), for whose sake all sorts of importunities are made with folded hands through male or female messengers, — for their sake no notoriety or sin is counted as small,

प्रक्षिप्तश्च भयेऽप्यात्मा द्रविणं च व्ययीकृतम्।
यान्येव च परिष्वज्य बभूवोत्तमनिर्वृतिः।।४२।।

They, by embracing whom great satisfaction was derived, involved me in hurling myself

into (hell) fears and into a lot of wasteful expenditure.

तान्येवास्थीनि नान्यानि स्वाधीनान्यममानि च।
प्रकामं संपरिष्वज्य किं न गच्छसि निर्वृतिम्।।४३।।

They are nothing but bones (or skeletons), independent and certainly not belonging to me. Instead of being obsessed by them, why not seek refuge in 'nivritti' i.e. detachment?

उन्नाम्यमानं यत्नाद् यन्नीयमानमधो ह्रिया।
पुरा दृष्टमदृष्टं वा मुखं जालिकयावृतम्।।४४।।

From her face, whether previously seen or not covered with a gauzy veil, I make an effort to lift the veil as she tries bashfully to keep it down.

तन्मुखं त्वत्परिक्लेशमसहद्भिरिवाधुना।
गृध्रैर्व्यक्तीकृतं पश्य किमिदानीं पलायसे।।४५।।

Oh. but why dost thou run away now to see that face, producing intolerable kleśas when it is revealed to you by the vultures.

परचक्षुर्निपातेभ्योऽप्यासीद्यत्परिरक्षितम्।
तदद्य भक्षितं यावत् किमीर्ष्यालो न रक्षसि।।४६।।

O jealous one! this body (of the woman) was sought to be protected by you (previously) even when others cast a glance over it. But

today, when it is being eaten (by vultures), you are doing nothing to protect it.

मांसोच्छ्रयमिमं दृष्ट्वा गृध्रैरन्यैश्च भक्षितम्।।
आहारः पूज्यतेऽन्येषां स्रक्चन्दनविभूषणैः।।४७।।

Seeing this lump of flesh being eaten by vultures and others as their food, (you don't save it); and, why was it earlier worshipped by you with flower garlands, sandal paste and ornaments?

'Kama' makes man run after women and they negotiate marital relationship with much ado. Mediators and messengers are despatched to persuade the other party, money is spent and even reprimands and insults are faced for the sake of finalising the contract with the bride's family. The only aim fulfilled after marriage is the satisfaction of sexual desire which, in turn, yields progeny. Much money is spent and much evil indulged in. In fact, all this is an exercise in futility. Who belongs to whom? Who is dependent on whom? Women have their independent entity and they surely do not belong to nor are related with the person who thinks he owns them by virtue of his marriage contract. Hence all 'kāma-vāsanā' or sexual lust must be curbed and a state of sorrowless and desireless detachment cultivated in the case of women.

Imagine a newly-wed bride, shy, bashful and reticent, face to face with her man trying to gently lift the gauzy veil from her beautiful, young face at their first meeting. Imagine now the same face many years hence, ugly and distorted by death and a ready morsel for carrion birds like vultures. Does this latter picture attract the very man who once worshipped its possessor with sandal paste,

ornaments and flower garlands and which he jealously shielded from the prying glances of others? Why does not he adore or embellish or worship it now? Or, does this last scene, the ultimate of all bodies, beautiful or ugly, teach him any lessons in 'nivritti'? The word 'sraga' actually means a mantra or sacred text written in the form a of garland.

निश्चलादपि ते त्रासः कंकालार्देवमीक्षितात्।
वेतालेनेव केनापि चाल्यमानाद् भयं न किम्।।४८।।

48-50. If you have fear even from the immobile by so looking at the skeleton, why is not then any fear from walking corpses moved around by some vétāla or spirit?

एकस्मादशनादेषां लालामेध्यं च जायते।
तत्रामेध्यमनिष्टं ते लालापानं कथं प्रियम्।।४९।।

The saliva and the faeces are born from the same food; then, why hate excreta and love drinking saliva?

तूलगर्भैर्मृदुस्पर्शैं रमन्ते नोपधानकैः।
दुर्गन्धं न स्रवन्तीति कामिनोऽमेध्यमोहिताः।।५०।।

Lustful persons do not feel happy or satiated when they touch things like pillows stuffed with soft material but infatuated with stench, they do not regard a woman's body as stinking.

The sight of an ugly, moth-eaten human skeleton fills a

person with fear, disgust and repulsion. But, are not all living bodies also mere skeletons (in the final analysis,) being moved by some kind of a goblin spirit in them? Why is there no fear or disgust at their sight? (Vētāla is a kind of demon, a goblin or ghost-spirit occupying a dead body.)

It is the same food in the body which produces urine and excreta as also saliva. Whereas every one hates the very sight of the former, he likes the latter when kissing a woman on the lips? Is not this an instance of wilful 'avidyā' or ignorance? Neat, clean and soft objects like a pillow stuffed with delicate cotton could be sweet to touch, but it does not afford the joy a dirty skeleton full of stinking faeces, gives to a man of lust.

यत्र च्छन्नेऽप्ययं रागस्तदच्छन्नं किमप्रियम्।
न चेत्प्रयोजनं तेन कस्माच्छन्नं विमृद्यते।।५१।।

51-53. If there is so much infatuation even for the camouflaged dirt, why then any dislike for that which is not covered? If there is no use of the latter, why hanker after the former with such effort?

यदि ते नाशुचौ रागः कस्मादालिंगसे ऽपरम्।
मांसकर्दमसंलिप्तं स्नायुबद्धास्थिपञ्जरम्।।५२।।

If you have no attachment or liking for that which is unclean, why embrace another one (out of sexual love) for he is merely plastered over with flesh and mud, a skeleton of bones bound by muscles.

स्वमेव बह्वमेध्यं ते तेनैव धृतिमाचर।
अमेध्यभस्त्रामपरां गूथ-घस्मर विस्मर।।५३।।

I myself possess many dirty things. That alone should teach (me) to be patient. Therefore, O eater of excreta! forget about other bundles of filth.

Things which are actually clean, gentle and soft to touch and embrace (like the pillow etc) are never loved as the unclean, dirty female frame is adored. The latter is, equally, a thing of no ultimate utility as the former. A person shuns dirt and scum and stink, but a beloved woman, — also a bundle of dirty marrow and bones — though elegantly plastered, becomes at once the object of a person's adoration. It must be understood that the most beautiful of bodies is only garbled vileness, unmanifest ugliness, a dung-heap covered with velvet. So, why be infatuated with other bodies?

Man carries a lot of impurities and stink in his own body such 'lāla' (saliva), 'singhāna' (nose mucus), 'mūtra' (urine), 'pureesha' (faeces) etc. This fact alone should teach him patience ('dhriti') with dirty objects. He, being himself so unclean, should not further run after unclean bodies. Hence, the advice to man, the voracious excreta-eater, the dirty wretch is not to engage his mind in sexual pursuits.

मांसप्रियोऽहमस्येति द्रष्टुं स्प्रष्टुं च वाञ्छसि।
अचेतनं स्वभावेन मांस त्वं कथमिच्छसि।।५४।।

54-56. I love the flesh of this (woman), and (so thinking) you desire to touch it, see it. O, why do you desire this flesh which, by nature is 'achetana' i.e. without mind or consciousness?

यदिच्छसि न तच्चित्तं द्रष्टुं स्प्रष्टुं च शक्यते।
यच्च शक्यं न तद्वेत्ति किं तदालिंगसे मुधा।।५५।।

Even if you wish, you cannot see or touch the mind. Whatever you may be able to (see and touch) it knows it not (being non-mental). Therefore, O fool! why do you embrace (the 'achetana') for nothing?

नामेध्यमयमन्यस्य कायं वेत्सीत्यनद्भुतम्।
स्वामेध्यमयमेव त्वं तं नावैषीति विस्मयः।।५६।।

It is not surprising that you do not see others' bodies as dirty but it is amazing that you don't understand even your own body to be unclean by nature.

No doubt, the loveliness of female flesh attracts a person and he wishes to touch its softness and look at its loveliness, but this flesh has no consciousness of itself. It is lifeless, dead. Need it be hankered after? On the other hand, the mind being subtle cannot be seen or touched. Why should a person be lured into embracing a flesh which is without 'chetanā' or consciousness? Granted, a person fails to appreciate the fact that the bodies of others he is in love with are unclean, but it is amazing he does not understand this fact about his own body too which is his nearest possession for touch and sight.

विघनार्कांशुविकचं मुक्त्वा तरुणपंकजम्।
अमेध्यशौण्डचित्तस्य का रतिर्गूथपंजरे।।५७।।

57-59. Forsaking a young lotus, blossomed under the rays of a cloudless sun, why do I, whose mind in unclean filth is absorbed, have been craving for this cage of dirty faeces?

मृदाद्यमेध्यलिप्तत्वाद्यदि न स्प्रष्टुमिच्छसि।
यतस्तन्निर्गतं कायात्तं स्प्रष्टुं कथमिच्छसि।।५८।।

If you do not wish to touch things which are full of shit, why do you wish to touch the body from which issues forth all such excreta?

यदि ते नाशुचौ रागः कस्मादालिंगसे परम्।
अमेध्यक्षेत्रसंभूतं तद्बीजं तेन वर्धितम्।।५९।।

If you have no infatuation for the unclean, why do you embrace others (i.e. the body of women) born in an unclean tabernacle from dirty seed nourished in the filth of the womb?

A person, normally, avoids touching or stepping upon filth; why should he then pine for a beloved's body which is equally full of filth inside like all human bodies. From an unclean tabernacle, that is a mother's womb, from an unclean seed and in the dark recesses of the womb is the human body born. It is all a story of scum, uncleanliness and dirt. Why should one be so much attached to such an unclean corntraption as the body?

अमेध्यभवमल्पत्वान्न वांछस्यशुचिं कृमिम्।
बह्वमेध्यमयं कायममेध्यजमपीच्छसि।।६०।।

60-61. You do not like even a bit an unclean worm because it is born in dirt but you do desire the body which is full of a lot of filth and is also born of filth.

न केवलममेध्यत्वमात्मीयं न जुगुप्ससि।
अमेध्यभाण्डानपरान् गूथघस्मर वांछसि।।६१।।

O you shit-eater! not only you do not abhor dirt that is within you, but you even hanker after other tabernacles of filth (i.e. other bodies).

A wriggling dirt worm is an object of despise for us but it is a pity that the human body which is conceived in filth and carries filth inside it, becomes a much sought-after object for sexual pleasures. Not only the shit within us does not disgust us but that we crave for it further by hankering after friends, relatives and beloved women. This is the irony of man's ignorance.

कर्पूरादिषु हृद्येषु शाल्यन्नव्यंजनेषु वा।
मुखक्षिप्तविसृष्टेषु भूमिरप्यशुचिर्मता।।६२।।

62-64. Even such clean things as camphor, cooked rice and savoury eatables, after being once taken inside the mouth, make the earth dirty after they are spat out or vomited.

यदि प्रत्यक्षमप्येतदमेध्यं नाधिमुच्यसे।
श्मशाने पतितान् घोरान् कायान् पश्यापरानपि।।६३।।

If you cannot forsake this patently filthy body, go to the cremation ground and look at the other hideous bodies littered there.

चर्मण्युत्पाटिते यस्माद् भयमुत्पद्यते महत्
कथं ज्ञात्वापि तत्रैव पुनरुत्पद्यते रतिः।६४।।

When the skin is torn off it i.e. the body, it creates terrible fears. Why then, even knowing this (that the body is the seat of fear), infatuation for it is born?

The earth, by nature, is called 'śuchi-svabhāvā' i.e. clean or pure by nature, but even clean things become filthy with the slightest contact with this bag of filth, the human body. Whatever pure and delicious food it may eat it will get converted into dirt and excreta. The pure earth absorbs all our shit within its kindly and broad bowls. The best method of realising this aspect of the body's filthiness is to visit a crematory or cremation ground so that the spectacle there may induce 'vairājna' or renunciation. The human body is very sensitive to pain and the slightest prick makes it shudder with fear. What sane man would fall in love with such a cowardly and fear-fraught thing as the human body?

काये न्यस्तो ऽप्यसौ गन्धश्चन्दनादेव नान्यतः ।
अन्यदीयेन गन्धेन कस्मादन्यत्र रक्ष्यते ।।६५।

65-67. The frangrance in someone's body is from the sandal wood paste put on it and not from any other (source.) Why do you then get attracted toward others' bodies over this alien fragrance?

यदि स्वभावदौर्गन्ध्याद् रागो नात्र शिवं ननु ।
किमनर्थरुचिर्लोकस्तं गन्धेनानुलिम्पति ।।६६।।

If it is not beneficent to have attachment for the body whose natural odour is foul, why do people craving for meaningless ('anartha') things, anoint the body with scents?

कायस्यात्र किमायातं सुगन्धि यदि चन्दनम्।
अन्यदीयेन गन्धेन कस्मादन्यत्र रज्यते।।६७।।

If it is the odour of sandal how can it come from the body? Why get attracted towards a thing when the fragrance is from something else?

Some people use odours and scents like those of sandal, rose and jasmine to sprinkle over their body and clothes or rub them as paste on hands and feet. Others get attracted towards them because they emit such lovely fragrance. Does not it look absolutely childish to get lured in this manner, because the so-called fragrance from a beloved's body is only the fragrance of the sandal paste and not of the body itself? The body being the repository of a lot of 'mala' or dirt is, by nature, mal-odorous. It is unwise to succumb to the lure of sweet-scented bodies. Remember and regard them as basically unclean and stinking and, therefore, reprehensible objects.

यदि केशनखैर्दीपैर्दन्तैः समलपाण्डरैः।
मलपङ्कधरोनग्नः कायः प्रकृतिभीषणः।।६८।।

68-69. If the naked body, full of filth and faeces, looks naturally horrible with its long hair and nails and dirty, pale teeth,

स किं संस्क्रियते यत्नादात्मघाताय शस्त्रवत्।
आत्मव्यामोहनोद्युक्तैरुन्मत्तैराकुला महि।।६९।।

Why is it polished meticulously like a weapon for suicide by persons who are out

to deceive themselves and are agitatedly wandering like mad on the earth?

The human body, for whose upkeep and embellishment people waste so much time and money is an ugly and fowl dust-bin only. There is a mad race of beauty aids and acoustic paraphernalia in the world. Frantic efforts are made to decorate the body by polishing nails, attractive hair-do styles (keśa-rachanā), making the lips red with lipstick or betel (tambūla), brushing the teeth, sprinkling fragrant ungents on well-washed limbs and putting on gaudy dresses etc. All this meticulous care of the body is tantamount to sharpening a weapon for self-destruction by self-deceiving people. For, they know not that the body is like a clay picture liable to break when it may. All ado to make it look different from its basic nature which is brittle and unclean is an exercise in self-deception.

कङ्कालान् कतिचिदृष्ट्वा श्मशाने किल ते घृणा।
ग्रामश्मशाने रमसे चलत्कङ्कालसंकुले।।७०।।

70-72. You have aversion to see some skeletons in a cremation ground but you take delight in the graveyard town full of walking masses of skeletons.

एवं चामेध्यमप्येतद् विना मूल्यं न लभ्यसे।
तदर्थमर्जनायासो नरकादिषु च व्यथा।।७१।।

And, these unclean bodies are also not available without a price. In order to earn enough money for it one has to undergo many hardships and suffer even the tortures of hells etc.

शिशोर्नार्जनसामर्थ्यं केनासौ यौवने सुखी।
यात्यर्जनेन तारुण्यं वृद्धः कामैः करोति किम्।।७२।।

In childhood, there is no capacity for amassing wealth; in youth how can one be happy without it? So, youth is wasted in earning money. And of what use are sexual desires for an old man?

The world is only a seething mass of walking skeletons. Millions of living dead team it. Why does not this spectacle of millions of skeletons fill one with awe and revulsion when the sight of a couple of skeletons in a grave-yard sends shivers of fear through one's body? To maintain this body, the walking skeleton, one has to earn a lot of wealth through fair or foul means. One has to labour hard for it as a trader or a bussiness-man or as a farmer or a labourer. This involves suffering and toil. If wealth is amassed through unfair means, damnation into hells is certain. Thus the demands of the body make one suffer both here and hereafter. When can one endeavour to earn money? Certainly not in childhood. Yes, youth is the most energetic span of life when one can exert frantically in this direction. So the period of youth is wasted in amassing material comforts. How therefore can one be happy even in youth? Only some persons may be fortunate to have a happy time by living on the money inherited as patrimony. In getting and spending we lay waste our energies. By the time enough wealth is there to purchase life's luxuries, one is already ageing and hardly any desire-sexual or otherwise — is left to be seriously pursued.

केचिद्दिनान्तव्यापारैः परिश्रान्ताः कुकामिनः।
गृहमागत्य सायाह्ने शेरते स्म मृता इव।।७३।।

73-75. Some evil, lustful people, exhausted after the day's job, return home after suṇ-set time and go to sleep like the dead.

दण्डयात्राभिरपरे प्रवासक्लेशदुःखिताः ।
वत्सरैरपि नेक्षन्ते पुत्रदारांस्तदर्थिनः ।।७४।।

There are others who suffer the tortures of staying away from their homes because of constant travel (abroad). They do not even see their sons and wives (for years) although desperately longing for them.

यदर्थमेव विक्रीत आत्मा कामविमोहितैः ।
तन्न प्राप्तं मुधैर्वायुर्नीतं तु परकर्मणा ।।७५।।

The purpose, for which these lustful ones mortgaged themselves, too remains unfulfilled. These baffled ones have only exhausted their day by doing others' work.

Some people have to keep themselves engaged in constant labour in order to earn money and maintain themselves. Sweating over odd jobs, they return home in the eveing as utterly tired and woe-begone wretches and go to sleep like dead. What can such persons think of enjoying sexual or married life? What love can they dole out to their families? As the sun rises, a similar routine, as for a beast of burden, awaits them. There are others who are always away from their homes travelling in alien lands for business or conquest, destined to expend their time and energies in alien lands and in the service of their masters. They harldy have any time to be with their wives and children however-much they may long to do so. The

purpose for which these slaves of lust mortgaged their lives, amassing wealth for joy, is also not realised. They exhaust their life 'samsakāras' in futile and servile pursuits under unworthy masters. The opportunity to perform wholesome action or 'sādhu karma' in life has been totally wasted by them in pursuing mirages.

विक्रीतस्वात्मभावानां सदा प्रेषणकारिणाम्।
प्रसूयन्ते स्त्रियोऽन्येषामटवीविटपादिषु।।७६।।

76-78. The wives of those who have sold their bodies and are always deputed hither and thither (for various duties) give birth to children under trees or in the forests.

रणं जीवितसन्देहं विशन्ति किल जीवितुम्।
मानार्थं दासतां यान्ति मूढाः कामविडम्बिताः।।७७।।

Others, for the sake of livelihood, enter war (as soldiers) although they fear losing their lives. Some fools, confounded by lust, became even slaves in order to save their self-respect (i.e. themselves).

छिन्द्यन्ते कामिनः केचिदन्ये शूलसमर्पि ।
दृश्यन्ते दह्यमानाश्च हन्यमाश्च शक्तिभिः।।७८।।

Other lustful fools get wounded or are consigned to the stake while still others are burnt alive or killed with swords.

Those who lead a constantly paripetatic life have a very miserable family life. Their bosses appoint them on run-

ning errands and so they are always on the move. Their wives are neglected and, in the course of their journeys, the poor ladies deliver sometimes even in a forest or under a shady wayside tree. How unenviable is their lot. Some enlist as king's men and soldiers to fight wars for him,-not that they love the ruler or the art of war but because they have to make a livelihood. Some may even be captured and converted into slaves on pain of death. In order to save their own life, they accept serfdom or 'dāsata' when overpowered by a stouter and superior opponent. Many others, in the act of trying to steal others' wives or wealth, get punished or hurt, receive injuries and are tortured or even sentenced to die on the cross ('śula'). Others are burnt alive or by a sword decapitated. It is their lust for wealth that brings all these sufferings on such as these.

अर्जनरक्षणनाशविषादैरर्थमनर्थमनन्तमवेहि ।
व्यग्रतया धनसक्तमतीनां नावसरो भवदुःखविमुक्तेः ।।७९।।

79. Wealth causes untold grief or agony in its amassing, protecting and losing. Owing to their bewilderment, persons whose hearts are attached to money get no chance of release from the misery of conditioned existence.

At every stage wealth brings misery. To amass it is a long ordeal because 'annutpannasya utpādanam dukham,' i.e. the production of the unproduced generates suffering. To guard it against the vagaries of man and nature brings continuous fear and hardship, because 'uparjitasya pancha-pratyayavayé-bhÿa paripālanam kashta-tarama', i.e. it is difficult to protect that which has been gathered from the ravages of the five elements like fire, water etc. To lose it is horrifying. If thieves steal it one is filled with 'taskarādibhirnāśād vishāda' i.e. grief at

the prospect of being stolen by thieves. People who are always running after wealth, because of the aforementioned situations can never have the chance to devote their time to seek emancipation from the dukha of 'samsāra' or 'bhava'.

एवमादीनवो भूयानल्पास्वादस्तु कामिनाम्।
शकटं वहतो यद्वत्पशोर्घासलवग्रहः।।८०।।

80-83. Thus, those with desires get very little comfort owing to their manifold miseries. They are like animals pulling a cart and getting only a bit of grass.

तस्यास्वादलवस्यार्थे यः पशोरप्यदुर्लभः।
हता दैवहतेनेयं क्षणसंपत् सुदुर्लभः।।८१।।

For the sake of that meagre joy which is easily available even to animals, this ill-fated person destroys his wealth of a life hard to come by.

अवश्यं गन्तुरल्पस्य नरकादिप्रपातिनः।
कायस्यार्थे कृतो योऽयं सर्वकालं परिश्रमः।।८२।।

These little desires are verily transient and they hurl a person into hells etc. The immense labour done at all times to procure them goes waste.

ततः कोटिशतेनापि श्रमभागेन बुद्धता।
चर्यादुःखान्महद्दुःखं सा च बोधिर्न कामिनाम्।।८३।।

On the other hand, even with a millionth part of that labour, one attains Buddhahood. This bodhi (knowledge) does not dawn on the lustful and, therefore, their suffering is greater than that for achieving bodhi-charyā.

Most people, carrying the load of worldly desires, are like beasts of burden who, for their daylong pains, receive only a few morsels of dry grass as their reward. They waste their precious human existence in slaving for paltry gains and hardly have a moment for higher pursuits. Like their desires, their gains too are fleeting. They little understand that a fraction of the efforts which they put in material pursuits, could get them nearer the goal of bodhi. As their minds have never worked in that direction, the truth has not dawned on them.

न शस्त्रं न विषं नाग्निर्न प्रपातो न वैरिणः ।
कामिनामुपमां यान्ति नरकादिव्यथास्मृतेः ।।८४।।

84-85. Remembering the torments of hells, there is nothing, in the context of (the sufferings) of persons of lustful desire, comparable to them (i.e. hell torments), neither weapons nor fire nor poison nor a fall from a cliff nor even enemies.

एवमुद्विज्य कामेभ्योः विवेके जनयेद्रतिम् ।
कलहायासशून्यासु शान्तासु वनभूमिषु ।।८५।।

Having thus developed fear about 'kāma' or desires, one should generate love for 'viveka' or wisdom and for quiet forest tracts free from quarrels and distractions.

The torments caused by weapons and other means are nothing when compared to those one has to endure in hells. No punishment by any king on the earth can be as severe as falling into 'naraka'. Whereas the suffering caused by a sword hit or fall from a cliff or whipping is swift and sudden, that of hells is long-lasting. This fear of the evil consequence of harbouring 'kāma' or desire should generate enough dispassion for earthly gains which, in turn, will lead to the acquisition of 'viveka' or discriminating wisdom. When such knowledge is attained all thoughts of wealth and worldly possessions disappear and one is ready to take to the life of an unattached 'parivrājaka' or wanderer in the forests where peace reigns supreme without any intrusion from worldly desires.

धन्यैः शशांककरचंदनशीतलेषु।
रम्येषु हर्म्यविपुलेषु शिलातलेषु।
निःशब्दसौम्यवनमारुतवीज्यमानैः।
चंक्रम्यते परहिताय विचिंत्यते च।।८६।।

86. Contemplating the welfare of beings these fortunate ones roam about in vast places—under rocks cool like moon beams, beautiful palace homes for them, fanned by pleasing and quiet forest breezes.

विहृत्य यत्र क्वचिदिष्टकालं शून्यालये वृक्षतले गुहासु।
परिग्रहरक्षणखेदमुक्तश्चरत्यपेक्षाविरतो यथेष्टम्।।८७।।

Dwelling there for the desired period in lonesome dwellings under trees and in caves, free from the sorrow of clinging to and protecting

(their possessions), he (the 'sādhaka') stays completely free from care.

स्वच्छन्दचार्यनिलयः प्रतिबद्धो न कस्यचित्।
यत् संतोषसुखं भुंक्ते तदिन्द्रस्यापि दुर्लभम्।।८८।।

Living as he desires, homeless and unfettered by anything, he enjoys such a pleasure of contentment as is even difficult of attainment by Indra.

The seeker dwells in the forest, enjoying the freedom of a king. With cool breezes from shady trees, dark caves and grotto cells are like a palace home to him. He is completely free from all encumbrances and has, therefore, no cares. He is the master of all that he surveys. His heart brims with the joy of 'santosha' or contentment beyond the reach of even Indra. Indra is the chief among deites of the intermediate region or the atmosphere in Hindu mythology. He comes next in precedence to the trinity of Brahma, Vishnu and Maheśa. He is primarily the god of rain and wields the 'vajra' or the thunder-bolt as his weapon. He is also one of the twelve 'ādityas' being the regent or guardian of the earth region.

एवमादिभिराकारैर्विवेकगुणभावनात्।
उपशांतवितर्कः सन् बोधिचित्तं तु भावयेत्।।८९।।

Having in such-like ways contemplated over the qualities of 'viveka' or discrimination one should completely set at rest contrary conceptions and contemplate on bodhichitta.

परात्मसमतामादौ भावयेदेवमादरात्।
समदुःखसुखाः सर्वे पालनीया मयातमवत्।।९०।।

In this manner one should first make a sincere effort to meditate upon the equality between oneself and other beings owing to identically experiencing joy and sorrow.

हस्तादिभेदेन बहुप्रकारः कायो यथैकः परिपालनीयः।
तथा जगद्भिन्नमभिन्नदुःखंसुखात्मकं सर्वमिदं तथैव।।९१।।

Just as the body alone has to be nurtured inspite of the variety of its parts like hands etc. so is this world of wide variety indivisible owing to joy and suffering being common to all sentient beings.

In the manner foretold in the previous verses, one must cultivate a discriminating intelligence so that, by sifting the noble from the ignoble and the base from the lofty, one becomes capable of mastering opposing tendencies and contrary conceptions and, with a mind established in calmness, one is able to meditate on the awakening mind. The first step in this direction is the contemplation of the 'prātma-samatā-bhāva', i.e. the feeling of equality with other beings. This is very appropriate because all sentient beings react to the experiences of joy and grief in the same manner. This common denominator should be enough to teach a person the lesson of equality with other beings. Only then can one think of removing others' sufferings as eagerly as he would wish to remove his own.

The human body is one but it comprises many parts like hands, feet, arms etc. Every limb is to be looked after for the overall health of the body. So also in this world each being is an important limb and has to be protected and nurtured for the welfare of the entire world.

यद्यप्यन्येषु देहेषु मद्दुःखं न प्रबाधते।
तथापि तद्दुःखमेव ममात्मस्नेहेनदुःसहम्।।९२।।

92-93. Although the pain that I bear does not cause a hindrance or harm to other beings. but that pain becomes unbearable for me because of self-love.

तथा यद्यप्यसंवेद्यमन्यद्दुःखं मयात्मना।
तथापि तस्य तद्दुःखमात्मस्नेहेन दुःसहम्।।९३।।

Similarly, even if other's pain is not borne by myself but that pain too becomes unbearable for me when others are conceived as my own self.

It is self-love or selfishness that makes a person sensitive to all type of personal pain which, of course, does not affect others. Similarly, others suffering, although entirely their concern, is also bound to become unbearable for one who has identified himself with fellow beings due to the practice of 'parātma-samatā.'

मयान्यद्दुःखं हन्तव्यं दुःखत्वादात्मदुःखवत्।
अनुग्राह्या मयान्येऽपि सत्त्वत्वादात्मसत्त्ववत्।।९४।।

94-96. Hence others' 'dukha' should be destroyed by me being identical with my own. Other beings should also be benefitted by me being sentient beings too like myself.

यदा मम परेषां च तुल्यमेव सुखं प्रियम्।
तदात्मनः को विशेषो येनात्रैव सुखोद्यमः।।९५।।

When happiness is as dear to me as to others in equal manner, what is special about myself that I am always striving for my own happiness alone?

यदा मम परेषां च भयं दुःखं च न प्रियम्।
तदात्मनः को विशेषो यत्तं रक्षामि नेतरम्।।९६।।

If, for me and for others, tear and suffering are not welcome, what is special about myself that I protect only myself and not others from fear and sufferings.

The argument of the previous 'slokas is continued in these verses also. When joy, pain and fear are common to all beings as also the wish to end suffering and fear in order to attain happiness, there remains no distinction between personal or private joy and pain and universal joy and pain. It is, therefore, vulgar to be selfishly ploughing a lonely furrow without sharing the burden of others and without attempting to lessen their misery. Once agian the principle of 'parātma-samatā' is emphasised here.

तद्दुःखेन न मे वाधेत्यतो यदि न रक्ष्यते।
नागामिकायदुःखान्मे बाधा तत्केन रक्ष्यते।।९७।।

97-99. If I do not protect others because their suffering causes no harm to me, why do I protect myself from even yet not-come sufferings (like those in hells). They too do not harm me as at present.

अहमेव तदापीति मिथ्येयं परिकल्पना।
अन्य एव मृतो यस्मादन्य एव प्रजायते।।९८।।

It is a misconceived fancy (mithyā) to think I shall be the same (person) in a next birth, for it is a different person who dies and a different person who is born again.

यदि तस्यैव यद्दुःखं रक्ष्यं तस्यैव तन्मतम्।
पाददुःखं न हस्तस्य कस्मात्तत्तेन रक्ष्यते।।९९।।

If it is to be believed that another's 'dukha' is to be warded off by himself alone, how is it then that the hand raises itself to protect the foot in pain when that 'dukha' is not the hand's own.

Man is extremely selfish by nature. Wheras he is indifferent to even the present dukha of his fellow beings, he is careful enough to protect himself against future sufferings (like those of hell tortures) by performing various acts of merit and self purification. However, in this context, he is working only on a fictitious premise, because the five-skandha body that is destroyed at death is necessrily not reborn as the same in the next birth. One must take a cue from the most natural way in which the human organs function. The hand at once lifts itself to ward off the pain of the foot or the face or the back although the hand is not affected by their suffering. Is not this an example for human beings to emulate for sharing the sorrows of their fellow-beings?

अयुक्तमपि चेदेतदहंकारात् प्रवर्तते।
तदयुक्तं निर्वर्त्यं तत्स्वमन्यच्च यथाबलम्।।१००।।

100. Even if this (approach) may be unjustified because it generates ego it is equally unjustifiable in the case of warding off your own suf-

fering. This (unjustifiable approach) must be discarded as far as possible in both cases.

It can be said that the exhortation to work for others as for yourself is likely to add nourishment to one's ego when one thinks; 'I will do this, I will do that, I will help, I will protect'. Such thoughts are bound to generate 'ahamkāra'. But the argument is equally applicable to similar impluses arising in a person while warding off his own suffering as well. Therefore, whatever may be unjustfiable will have to be rejected both for oneself and for others and, then, why ward off your own 'dukha' also?

संतानः समुदायश्च पङ्क्ति सैनादिवन्मृषा।
यस्य दुःखं स नास्त्यस्मात् कस्य तत्स्वं भविष्यति।।१०१।।

101. A continuity like a row and an assemblage like an army are in fact false (entities). He whose dukha is felt (or he who is considered as the source of dukha) does not exist. Then whose that (suffering) will you own?

Undoubtedly, all continuum or aggregation is without any substantial reality. He whom one thinks as possessing dukha or as giving dukha does not exist. There is, in fact, no self either. Whom to own then, because in the absence of an 'ālambana' or support, everything is false and unreal. So also is true of the so called self when, in reality, no self is there either. Just as when a number of ants do not join one after the other, there is no 'pankti' or row, and just as without an assemblage of elephants, horses, chariots, foot-soldiers there is nothing that could be called an army or a 'sena', so is the case with the mass of beings. Hence it is a misconception to attribute an independent identity to 'santāna' or 'samudāya' just as it is mere fancy to call a collection of beads a 'mālā' or a

rosary. The word 'santana' means continued succession, continuous flow, an uninterrupted series. 'Samuḍāya' means union, multitude. In Buddhist parlance it denotes the aggregate of constituent elements or factors of any being or existence, 'Pankti' means a row, a set, a collections of five, a group or assembly or troop, a company of persons eating together. 'Sena' means an army, a missile a dart, battle-array, a band of drilled mass, a unit consisting of three elephants, three chariots, nine horses and fifteen foot.

अस्वामिकानि दुःखानि सर्वाण्येवाविशेषतः ।
दुखःत्वादेव वार्याणि नियमस्तत्र किंकृतः ।।१०२ ।।

102-103. All dukhas are inherently without a master; so they have to be removed without any distinction of one's own or those of others.

दुखंः कस्मान्निवार्यं चेत्सर्वेषामविवादतः ।
वार्यं चेत्सर्वमप्येवं न चेदात्मापि सर्ववत् ।।१०३ ।।

Why should, indisputably enough, the misèry of everyone be removed? Because, all beings are like one's own self. It has to be removed not only in one's own but everyone's case.

Dukha being universal has no specific master or owner. It is the lot of every sentient being, a common destiny. Hence, distinctions of mine and thine are foolish and perfunctory. Being the tormentor of one and all, it has to be eradicated at all levels and at every place. All sentient beings are entitled to the same cure from this common malady which affects all cyclic life.

कृपया बहु दुःखं चेत्कस्मादुत्पद्यते बलात्।
जगद्दुःखं निरूप्येदं कृपादुःखं कथं बहु।।१०४।।

104-106. (It may be argued that) compassion may bring much 'dukha', so why practise it assiduously? However, looking at the misery of the world, the 'dukha' generated by 'kripā' or compassion appears negligible.

बहूनामेकदुःखेन यदि दुःखं विगच्छति।
उत्पाद्यमेव तद्दुःखं सदयेन परात्मनोः।।१०५।।

If by virtue of one 'dukha' the 'dukha' of many can be removed, that dukha should be produced with kind-heartedness for the sake of others and oneself.

अतः सुपुष्पचन्द्रेण जानतापि नृपापदम्।
आत्मदुःखं न निहतं बहुनां दुःखिनां व्ययात्।।१०६।।

Thus did bodhisattva Supuśpa Chandra, even though aware of the misery the king would inflict, did not ward off his own dukha in order to exhaust the sufferings of the many

Some may argue that the practice of 'karunā' or compassion may itself generate some kind of misery in as much as the kindly person has to worry and bother about others' dukha and thus make his own mind grieve. Be as it may, this grief or misery of the compassionate being is an individual's and is, therefore, negligibly meagre as compared to the dukha of the world at large. Hence,

compassion for all must be practised even at the risk of a little personal inconvenience. One must take a cue from the story of bodhisattva Supśpachandra as narrated in the Samādhirāja sutra: "In ages gone by lived a Tathagata, Ratna-padmachandra. When he departed after long years of his ministry the 'śāsana' fell on bad days. King Śūradatta ruled the land at that time with his capital at Ratnāvali. People got deviated from dharma during his rule. Out of compassion for them many bodhisattvas came down to roam in the land but they were turned out of the king's dominions and they made their resort in a forest tract called samanta-bhadra. The noble Supuśpachandra was among them. The compassionate one took pity on the people and resolved to bring them back to the righteous path after going to the king's capital. He spoke of his resolve to other 'parivrājaka' brahmacharis. He left the forest tract, reached the capital city and preached dharma to the public, the princes and the king's ministers. Seeing him do this, the king got angry and ordered his sons to kill him. Unwilling to do so, they conveyed the orders to the executioner, Nandika. He cut the bodhisattva's hands and feet and gouged his eyes. As the bodhisattva departed, great miracles happened one after the other, seeing which the king concluded that the bhikshu must be a bodhisattva, and was very repentant for his sins."

एवं भावितसंतानाः परदुःखसमप्रियाः ।
अवीचिमवगाहन्ते हंसाः पद्मवनं यथा ।।१०७।।

107-110. Thus, with their mental impulses detached from enjoyment, they (the bodhisattvas)gladly enter even the 'avīchi' hell like a swan entering a lotus pool.

मुच्यमानेषु सत्त्वेषु ये ते प्रामोद्यसागराः।
तैरेव ननु पर्याप्तं मोक्षेणारसिकेन किम्।।१०८।।

With all the beings released, the resultant ocean of joy will be sufficent (for all beings to be happy); what use, then, is the longing for (individual) liberation?

अतः परार्थं कृत्वापि न मदो न च विस्मयः।
न विपाकफलाकांक्षा परार्थैकान्ततृष्णया।।१०९।।

Therefore, even while working for (the welfare of) others, there should be neither conceit nor amazement. With the sole craving for others' good, there should also be no desire for the fruit of action.

तस्माद्यथान्तशोऽवर्णादात्मानं गोपयाम्यहम्।
रक्षाचित्तं दयाचित्तं करोम्येवं परेष्वपि।।११०।।

Just as I shall protect myself restlessly from unpleasant things so shall I make my mind full of compassion and care for others.

For the bodhisattva whose soul aim is the well-being of sattvas, no sacrifice is too great and no ordeal too harsh to accept. He does not even mind suffering the tortures of the burning 'avīchi' 'naraka' if others benefit from his suffering. The great flood-tide of joy released by the bodhisattva's compassion is enough to release all beings form samsāra and grant them liberation. There is, therefore, no use of aspiring after individual nirvāna as con-

templated in Hinayāna. The services and sacrifices rendered by a bodhisattva are totally motiveless and without any wish for personal aggrandizement. For such a one as he, noble conduct conducive to the general good is his best reward, his release, his nirvana.

अभ्यासादन्यदीयेषु शुक्रशोणितबिन्दुषु
भवत्यहमिति ज्ञानमसत्यपि हि वस्तुनि।।१११।।

111-115. That they are mine or the like realisation is born of the constant thinking of things, — like the drops of others' blood and sperm as our own.

तथा कायोऽन्यदीयोऽपि किमात्मेति न गृह्यते।
परत्वं तु स्वकायस्य स्थितमेव न दुष्करम्।।११२।।

So why isn't another's body accepted as my own? And, it is not difficult to regard my own body also as that of others.

ज्ञात्वा सदोषमात्मानं परानपि गुणोदधीन्।
आत्मभावपरित्यागं परादानं च भावयेत्।।११३।।

Realising the mistake of cherishing ones own self and thinking of the means of merit in cherishing others, one should abjure all selfishness and practise the owning of others.

कायस्यावयवत्वेन यथाभीष्टाः करादयः ।
जगतोऽवयवत्वेन तथा कस्मान्न देहिनः ।।११४।।

Just as hands etc, are cherished being limbs of the same body why are not then all beings regarded as limbs of the same world?

यथात्मबुद्धिरभ्यासात् स्वकायेऽस्मिन् निरात्मके ।
परेष्वपि यथात्मत्वं किमभ्यासान्न जायते ।।११५।।

Just as a sense of ownership towards this non-self body is born through constant practice, so also how cannot a sense of (identical) ownership be born for other beings?

एवं परार्थं कृत्वापि न मदो न च विस्मयः ।
आत्मानं भोजयित्वैव फलाशा न च जायते ।।११६।।

Working like this for others, there should neither be conceit nor amazement. When one feeds oneself there is no desire for any fruit (of the action of feeding one-self); then, why desire fruit of action done for others' sake?

This physical body of ours which we love so much and claim our very own is actually the product of the drops of others' blood ('śonita') and semen ('śukra'). This is so because we constantly think it as something very personal. Similarly, through constant reflection and practice, one can come to regard other bodies also as his own and one's own body as theirs, thus establishing

'parātma-samatā'. A butcher can cut away living animals like carrots without any remorse while another person may be stunned at that sight. Both these reactions are based on 'abhyāsa' or practice. Instead of lauding one's own self, one should cherish others as that alone will produce merit. As each limb of the body, although apart by itself, is an integral part of the body, so also every jiva or sentient being is an integral limb of the 'jagata'.

This body is non-soul or non-self entity. Even then, owing to constant 'abhyāsa' with the body, ego and conceit about it are produced. Why not, then, cultivate similar feelings of owning other bodies or other beings?

When, through constant practice, the mind gets used to administering comfort and compassion to others, no feeling of conceit or vanity or wonder should enter it, as the acts of noble service towards others would be an automatic, natural process in the case of an awakening mind. This would also eliminate all desire for the fruit of meritorious deeds done, just as eating food etc. is a normal process and not done for any expected fruit or result thereof.

तस्माद्यथार्तिशोकादेरात्मानं गोप्तुमिच्छसि।
रक्षाचित्तं दयाचित्तं जगत्यभ्यस्यतां तथा।।११७।।

117-118. Therefore, just as you want to protect yourself against pain and grief, so should you practise with a caring and compassionate mind for (the good of) the world.

अध्यतिष्ठदतो नाथः स्वनामाप्यवलोकितः।
पर्षच्छरद्यभयमप्यपनेतुं जनस्य हि।।११८।।

> The great lord Avalokites'vara prescribed his name also as most mighty (and efficacious) in rescuing people from the fear of working in the midst of others.

Everyone is cautions enough about his own name and honour and endeavours to guard against any blemish coming to his person. Likewise should a person assiduously practise 'karunā' and 'maitri' with other beings for the welfare of the world. It is for this reason that the compassionate Lord Avalokitesvara emphasised the efficacy of his own name as a great talisman against all kinds of fear. "He who recites my name will not have to face any embarrasment or fear while he works in the midst of people for their welfare", said he.

दुष्करान्न निवर्तेत यस्मादभ्यासशक्तितः ।
यस्यैव श्रवणात् त्रासस्तेनैव न विना रतिः ।।११९।।

119-121. One should no shy away from difficulty because, with the power of 'abhyāsa' or practice, one can so change that one may not at all feel happy in the absence of a person whose very name was once so frightening for him.

आत्मानं च परांश्चैव यः शीघ्रं त्रातुमिच्छति ।
स चरेत् परमं गुह्यं परात्मपरिवर्तनम् ।।१२०।।

He who wants to save himself and others soon should practise the most secret path of exchanging his own self for others;

यस्मिन्नात्मन्यतिस्नेहादल्पादपि भयाद् भयम्।
न द्विषेत्कस्तमात्मानं शत्रुवद्यो भयावहः ।।१२१ ।।

He, who out of love for his body, gets frightened even with a little fear, does he not hate himself (i.e. his body) for giving him fear like an enemy?

The constant exercise of trying to accept others as one's own self will result in turning even unpleasant and unwelcome things and persons into acceptable ones. The path of exchanging one's self for others is the most secret and efficacious of paths. One's own body is one's enemy, because it creates all kinds of hobgoblins of fear as one is perservering hard for the body's well-being. Why not then take good care to work for others' good with the same zeal especially when, in the latter case, Lord Avalokiteśvara has granted 'abhaya' or the no-fear gift to the practitioners?

यो मान्द्यक्षुत्पिपासादिप्रतीकारचिकीर्षया।
पक्षिमत्स्यमृगान् हन्ति परिपन्थं च तिष्ठति ।।१२२ ।।

122-124. He, who with the desire of removing hunger, thirst etc. kills birds, fish and deer etc. and stalks highways (as a robber),

यो लाभसत्क्रियाहेतोः पितरावपि मारयेत्।
रत्नत्रयस्वमादद्याद् येनावीचीन्धनो भवेत् ।।१२३ ।।

who, for the sake of gain and comforts, would kill even his parents, grab the property of the Three Gems, is bound to

be consigned to the fires of 'avīchi' hell.

कः पंडितस्तमात्मानमिच्छेद् रक्षेत्प्रपूजयेत्।
न पश्येच्छत्रुवच्चैनं कश्चैनं प्रतिमानयेत्।।१२४।।

What wise man would crave for, protect and worship this body and would not, instead, regard it as an enemy? Who would have any regard for it?

What sins does not a hungry person commit? In order to extinguish the fire of hunger, he kills birds and animals, robs his fellow beings, waylays unsuspecting travellars, does not hesitate from murdering even his parents and friends, speaks from temples and monasteries and, in consequence, buys his own condemnation to the hell fires of 'avīchi'. He does all this for the sake of the body. However, no sane person would have any respect for such an enemy as this, our body.

यदि दास्यामि किं भोक्ष्ये इत्यात्मार्थे पिशाचता
यदि भोक्ष्ये किं ददामीति परार्थे देवराजता।।१२५।।

125-129. 'If I give in charity, what shall I eat myself?' This kind of mentality is devilish. 'If I eat myself, what shall I give in charity?' This mentality is godly.

आत्मार्थं पीडयित्वान्यं नरकादिषु पच्यते।
आत्मानं पीडयित्वा तु परार्थं सर्वसंपदः।।१२६।।

If one troubles others for the sake of oneself, one is delivered unto the tortures of

hells etc. If one troubles one-self for the sake of others, one attains all riches.

दुर्गतिर्नीचता मौर्ख्यं ययैवात्मोन्नतीच्छया।
तामेवान्यत्र संक्राम्य सुगतिः सत्कृतिर्मतिः ।।१२७।।

Those striving for selfish advancement attain damnation or 'durgati', condemnation or 'neechatā' and stupidity or 'maurkhyama'. Transferring the same approach to others the result is 'sugati' or joyful realms, 'satakrita' or respect and 'mati or wisdom'.

आत्मार्थं परमाज्ञाप्य दासत्वाद्यनुभूयते।
परार्थं त्वेनमाज्ञाप्य स्वामित्वाद्यनुभूयते।।१२८।।

Ordering about others for one's own sake spells for servitude; ordering about oneself for others' sake one experiences real overlordship.

ये केचिद् दुःखिता लोके सर्वे ते स्वसुखेच्छया।
ये केचित् सुखिता लोके सर्वे तेऽन्य सुखेच्छया।।१२९।।

Those who are unhappy in this world are so bacause of a craving for selfish joy. Those who are happy in this world are so because of a craving for others' happiness.

One must live and act for the sake of others. Those who cannot give in charity are wolves in human skin,

because they are utterly selfish, crude and cruel. Charity is a godly virtue whereas selfishness is the devil's way. One should not go on ordering about people for the purpose of selfish aggrandisement. Instead, service to others is the surest way to mental joy. Only unpopularity, disrespect and damnation are in store for those who are selfish. It is only through helping the needy, succouring the down-trodden and supporting his less fortunate fellow beings that one can earn lasting fame and universal approbation. This is not only true here but also hereafter. Happiness, joy and contentment here and a noble birth in the next are assured for one who works selflessly for others' sake.

बहुना वा किमुक्तेन द्दश्यतामिदमन्तरम्।
स्वार्थार्थिनश्च बालस्य मुनेश्चान्यार्थकारिणः।।१३०।।

130-131. Why need say more? Just look at the difference between how the foolish commoners work only for their own benefit and the Buddhas work for the benefit of others.

न नाम साध्यं बुद्धत्वं संसारेऽपि कुतः सुखम्।
स्वसुखस्यान्यदुःखेन परिवर्तमकुर्वतः।।१३१।।

It is impossible to attain Buddhahood much less happiness in the world, without exchanging one's own happiness for the sorrows of others.

Śāntideva says that the subject needs no further elaboration. It is common knowledge that whereas the 'prathagjanāh' or ordinary people are guided by selfishness, the Buddhas' motive force is 'para-kalyāna' or the

well-being of others. There is all the difference between selfish-ness and self-lessness. There can be no real happiness even in this life without practising 'parātma parivartana' or exchanging one-self with that of others, that is, taking their sufferings on one-self and offering them comfort in return. This alone will provide a person with the joys of earthly and godly life in his various births till he finally attains Buddha-hood.

आस्तां तावत्परो लोको दृष्टोऽप्यर्थो न सिध्यति।
भृत्यस्याकुर्वतः कर्म स्वामिनोऽददतो भृतिम्।।१३२।।

132-136. Even in this world the desired result is not achieved when the servant does not do his work and the master does not pay the servant.

त्यकत्वान्योन्यसुखोत्पादं दृष्टादृष्टसुखोत्सवम्।
अन्योन्यदुःखनाद् घोरं दुःखं गृह्णन्ति मोहिताः।।१३३।।

Giving up (the path of) generating happiness for one another and for providing immense joy—seen and unseen—deluded persons receive much 'dukha' by causing pain to one another.

उपद्रवा ये च भवन्ति लोके यावन्ति दुःखानि भयानि चैव।
सर्वाणि तान्यात्मपरिग्रहेण तत् किं ममानेन परिग्रहेण।।१३४।।

If all the mischiefs that happen in the world and all its suffering and fears are the result of attachment to one's own self, what use is this attachment to me?

आत्मानमपरित्यज्य दुःखं त्यक्तुं न शक्यते।
यथाग्निमपरित्यज्य दाहं त्यक्तुं न शक्यते।।१३५।।

Without forsaking one-self it is not possible to forsake 'dukha' just as it is not possible to avoid being burnt unless one gives up fire.

तस्मात्स्वदुःखशान्त्यर्थं परदुःखशमाय च।
ददाम्यन्येभ्य आत्मानं परान् गृह्णामि चात्मवत्।।१३६।।

Therefore, for the sake of eradicating my own suffering and for the sake of removing others' suffering, I shall give myself over to others and accept others as my own self.

Not to speak of the next world, even on this earth no beneficial activity is possible without cultivating the desire for 'para-kalyāna' or the well-being of others. A servant who is a bad workman and a master who is a bad paymaster can both achieve nothing. The tendency to help others is the source of all hapiness in the seen present and the unseen future. However, ignorant persons who don't understand this simple fact, cause others suffering and create suffering for themselves also. Selfishness or attachment to one's own self is the root of all the sixteen kinds of fears and mental unhappiness in the world. The devil of self attachment casts such a spell that one goes on revolving along the rounds of birth and death for hundreds of years. Why should not such an enemy be abandoned for-ever.? There can be no happiness without renouncing self-attachment. One can avoid being burnt only if one withdraws from the fire. Therefore, in order to quieten the upheavals of the mind and to be able to do

good to others, one must accept others as his own self and completely identify himself with them.

अन्यसंबद्धमस्मीति निश्चयं कुरु हे मनः।
सर्वसत्त्वार्थमुत्सृज्य नान्यच्चिन्त्यं त्वयाधुना।।१३७।।

137-139. O mind; have this conviction: 'I am with others linked'. Now, nothing else should be thought of by you except the well-being of 'sattvas'.

न युक्तं स्वार्थदृष्टयापि तदीयैश्चक्षुरादिभिः।
न युक्तं स्यन्दितुं स्वार्थमन्यदीयैः करादिभिः।।१३८।।

It is not proper to have a selfish view (of things) with such-like eyes (i.e. dedicated to others' welfare), nor is it proper to advance self-interest with one's hands etc. having been dedicated for others' sake.

तेन सत्त्वपरो भूत्वा कायेऽस्मिन् यद्यदीक्षसे।
तत्तदेवापहत्यास्मात् परेभ्यो हितमाचर।।१३९।।

Therefore, devoted to serving sentient beings or sattvas, whatever you see on this body of yours, seize that from it and serve the interests of others with it.

Having thoroughly understood the advantages of giving up the self and exchanging it for others i.e. 'ātma-tyāga' and 'para-parigrahana', and resolving on self-renunciation, one must convince one's mind that its only

thoughts henceforth should be those of service to others. Not only that, even physical limbs like the eyes, the hand, the feet etc, having been dedicated to the resolve of 'para-kalyāna' should not be used for any selfish purposes at all. Whatever physical and mental qualities be there, whatever material objects be with one's own body, should henceforth be used for benefitting sentient beings.

हीनादिष्वात्मतां कृत्वा परत्वमपि चात्मनि।
भावयेर्ष्यां च मानं च निर्विकल्पेन चेतसा।।१४०।।

140. Onwing up lesser being etc. as one's own self and one's own self as others, one should deliberate upon envy and ego with a mind free from distorted concepts.

In this śloka, Śāntideva suggests a very useful but special 'chintana vidhi', a formula for deep mental reflection. Put one's own self on one side and the rest of the crowd on the other. The latter consists of beings who may be inferior, equal or superior to one self. Towards the first catogory, one feels conceited, towards the second competitive in envy and towards the third jealous. Such feelings must be obliterated by constantly practising identification with others. On the one side is one's own selfish self, on the other side is the vast majority of other 'sattvas'. However much importance one may give to one self, it would be futile as compared with the attention which the vast majority deserves. Hence the only wise course is to think of the well-being of that majority vis a vis one's own solitary self. The thought process that will lead to this conclusion is further analysed in the following ślokas.

एष सत्क्रियते नाहं लाभी नाहमयं यथा।
स्तूयतेऽयमहं निन्दयो दुःखितोऽहमयं सुखी।।१४१।।

141-143. This (self) is honoured, I am not; I do not have profit as does this (self). This he is praised, I am derided. I am unhappy, this (self) is happy.

अहं करोमि कर्माणि, तिष्ठत्येष तु सुस्थितः।
अयं किल महान् लोके, नीचोऽहं किल निर्गुणः।।१४२।।

I work, this (self) stays put. This is renowned as great in the world and I, a low person, possess no quality.

किं निर्गुणेन कर्तव्यं सर्वस्यात्मा गुणान्वितः।
सन्ति ते येष्वहं नीचः सन्ति ते येष्वहं वरः।।१४३।।

What is to be done by one without qualities? Oh, I have all the good qualities. There are those for whom I am an inferior, there are those for whom I am a superior.

While reflecting mentally as suggested earlier, one should put oneself on the side of the vast mass of beings and let the selfish self-soul stand opposite all by itself and then argue with it as under; "This selfish 'atmā' or self is honoured, praised and respected unlike us all. It is happy while we are unhappy, why this injustice? We labour hard and this self sits idle. Even then it is renowned and we are in oblivion without anything to redeem us. But no, we possess qualities like 'Tathagata-garbha'! By practice, we can cultivate them

well and so can come to possess great qualities. Therefore, there is no cause for disappointment". All this thought process is however comparative, because we may be inferior to some but superior to many.

शीलदृष्टिविपत्त्यादि क्लेशशक्त्या न मद्वशात्।
चिकित्स्योऽहं यथाशक्ति पीडाप्यङ्गीकृता मया।।१४४।।

144-146. The misfortunes from conduct and sight i.e. 'śīla' and 'drṣti' are also not under my control, being under the power of 'kleśas'. I deserve to be cured of this (by the self), and I have accepted suffering also.

अथाहमचिकित्स्योऽस्य कस्मान्मामवमन्यसे।
किं ममैतद्गुणैः कृत्यमात्मा तु गुणवानयम्।।१४५।।

If I am not curable by this (soul-self), why belittle me? What use are the qualities of such a one to me although the self is reputed to be full of qualities.

दुर्गतिव्यालवक्त्रस्थेनैवास्य करुणा जने।
अपरान् गुणमानेन पंडितान् विजिगीषते।।१४६।।

This (soul-self), lying in the jaws of the serpent of 'durgati' (owing to its delusions) has no compassion for beings, is conceited about its superficial qualities, and wants to run down even the learned wise.

Upto the last verse above, Śantideva has depicted the

feeling of jealousy against the so-called superior but self-ish self-soul. Next follow feelings of competitiveness which are aroused by taking this self-soul as an equal opponent.

सममात्मानमालोक्य यतः स्वाधिक्यवृद्धये।
कलहेनापि संसाध्यं लाभसत्कारमात्मनः।।१४७।।

147-150. For the sake of augmenting my own excellence by regarding the self-soul as an equal, I shall gain (things like) profit and honour for myself even if achieved, through quarrels ('kalaha').

अपि सर्वत्र मे लोके भवेयुः प्रकटा गुणाः।
अपि नाम गुणा येऽस्य न श्रोष्यन्त्यपि केचन।।१४८।।

May my own qualities be well-known all over the world and may none hear what-ever qualities this (soul-self) may possess.

छाद्येरन्नपि मे दोषाः स्यान्मे पूजास्य नो भवेत्।
सुलब्धा अद्य मे लाभाः पूजितोऽहमयं न तु।।१४९।।

May all my faults be hidden; may I be worshipped but certainly not this (soul-self). May all (material) gains come handy to me today, may I be honoured and not this (self).

पश्यामो मुदितास्तावच्चिरादेनं खलीकृतम्।
हास्यं जनस्य सर्वस्य निन्द्यमानमितस्ततः।।१५०।।

I shall joyfully look at it being at once denigrated, at being the butt of everybody's ridicule and being criticised here and there.

In order to humiliate this selfish self-soul, one must broadcast one's own qualities to everyone and also see to it that none listens to the so called qualities of the self. After thus rendering it to dust one should cast a long, lingering look of derision at the hypocrite self and reduce it to an object of universal ridicule.

Hereafter follow verses wherein the practice of regarding oneself as superior to the self-soul and generating a lot of zeal for that purpose is described.

अस्यापि हि वराकस्य स्पर्धा किल मया सह।
किमस्यश्रुतमेतावत् प्रज्ञा रूपं कुलं धनम्।।१५१।।

151-154. Oh even this wretched one (i.e. the self-soul) is competing with me! What? Are its knowledge (śrutama'), wisdom (prajnā'), form (rūpa), lineage ('kulama') and wealth (like mine)?

एवमात्मगुणान् श्रुत्वा कीर्त्यमानानितस्ततः।
संजातपुलको हृष्टः परिभोक्ष्यसे सुखोत्सवम्।।१५२।।

Thus hearing of my own qualities being praised all over, it (the self-soul) should enjoy a feeling of joyous elation with its hair standing on end (owing to horripilation).

यद्यप्यस्य भवेल्लाभो ग्राह्योऽस्माभिरसौ बलात्।
दत्त्वास्मै यापनामात्रमस्मत्कार्यं करोति चेत्।।१५३।।

If it (the self-soul) makes a material gain out of it, that has to be snatched from it forcibly by me, provided it works for me.

सुखाच्च च्यावनीयोऽयं योज्योऽस्मद्व्यथया सदा।
अनेन शतशः सर्वे संसारव्यथिता वयम्।।१५४।।

If it (the self-soul) has to be pulled down from joy and yoked to suffering constantly, well, for hundreds of times have not we been made to suffer by it through 'samsāra'.

Now, all the above four verses suggest the manner by which, assuming a position superior to the soul-self, one can completely look down upon it and be its total tormentor by rendering it to a nullity which it actually is. The second line of the last sloka also makes one aware of 'ātma-parigraha' or the hold of the self on the mind which must be completely shaken off. This holding on to the self has landed us into the never-ending rounds of 'samsāra' life after life. Hence, the way to break its shackles must be practised by the aspiring mind. How the mind should practise this, is explained in the succeeding ślokas'.

अप्रमेया गताः कल्पाः स्वार्थं जिज्ञासतस्तव।
श्रमेण महतानेन दुःखमेव त्वयार्जितम्।।१५५।।

155-159. (O mind)
Innumerable ages have gone by in pur-

suit of selfish ends by you but with all this labour of yours you have earned only dukha.

मद्विज्ञप्त्या तथात्रापि प्रवर्तस्वाविचारतः ।
द्रक्ष्यस्येतद्गुणान् पश्चाद्भूतं हि वचनं मुनेः ।।१५६।।

Therefore, at my bidding, engage yourself in this (task of para-kalyāna') at once. You will certainly realise the advantages of such a conduct, because infallible is the word of Lord Buddha.

अभविष्यदिदं कर्म कृतं पूर्वं यदि त्वया।
बौद्धं संपत्सुखं मुक्त्वा नाभविष्यदियं दशा।।१५७।।

Had you exchanged such karmas in the past, there would not of have been this situation as one devoid of the joy of Lord Buddha's bliss.

तस्माद्यथान्यदीयेषु शुक्रशोणितबिन्दुषु।
चकर्थ त्वमहंकारं तथान्येष्वपि भावय।।१५८।।

Therefore, just as you own these other drops of blood and sperm, your body or yourself, so also should you regard, other sentient beings similarly i.e. as yourself.

अन्यदीयश्चरो भूत्वा कायेऽस्मिन् यद्यदीक्षसे।
तत्तदेवापहृत्यार्थं परेभ्यो हितमाचर।।१५९।।

After becoming devoted to others, whatever you see on your body, take that away for giving to others for their good.

Due to the fault of 'ātma-parigrahana' or attachment to self the mind has always wandered and foundered on the rock of 'moha' and has earned only suffering birth after birth. So, in accordance with the ever-true, ever-eternal word of Lord Buddha, by practising 'parātma-samatā', the mind must become aware of the joy of 'parakalyāna'. It should cease to see any distinction of mine and thine and completely identify it-self with other beings.

अयं सुस्थः परो दुःस्थो नीचैरन्योऽयमुच्चकैः ।
परः करोत्ययं नेति कुरुष्वेर्ष्यां त्वमात्मनि ।।१६० ।।

160-161. 'This (selfish) one is happy, another is not; this one is high, another is low. The other one does this but not this one'. In this manner jealousy (eērsha') with one's mind must be practised.

सुखाच्च च्यावयात्मानं परदुःखे नियोजय ।
कदायं किं करोतीति छलमस्य निरुपय ।।१६१ ।।

Pull down your own self from joy and yoke it to the sufferings of others. 'Why does it (that is, I or the mind) do like this?', (so saying) examine its faults.

Everyone wants joy but finds himself in the midst of suffering. This is so because everyone, owing to ignorance, does not know the way to the cessation of suffering. Nor is the way to generating joy understood by people. Hence, combined with compassion, one must resolve to

take upon oneself others' sufferings. Many are the facets of dukha: 'durgati dukha' leads one to fallen states of existence; 'sugati dukha' brings birth, disease and death. The 'rupa'-cum-'rupa-dhatu dukha' has the sufferings of samskāras. The resolve to annihilate dukha should embrace all these aspects. Further follows the instruction as to how one can take others' sufferings on one self.

अन्येनापि कृतं दोषं पातयास्यैव मस्तके।
अल्पमप्यस्य दोषं च प्रकाशय महामुनेः।।१६२।।

162-165. A fault committed even by another person should be taken over on myself but even the slightest fault of mine has to be highlighted to everybody.

अन्याधिकयशोवादैर्यशोऽस्य मलिनीकुरु।
निकृष्टदासवच्चैनं सत्त्वकार्येषु वाहय।।१६३।।

By singing the glory of others a great deal, my own should be garbled or tarnished. And, acting as a despicable slave, I should always remain absorbed in others' works.

नागन्तुकगुणांशेन स्तुत्यो दोषमयो ह्ययम्।
यथा कश्चित्न जानीयाद् गुणमस्य तथा कुरु।।१६४।।

This (one's own self) should not be praised for a modicum of temporary, good quality. Behave in a manner that nobody comes to know of these 'gunas'.

संक्षेपाद्यद्यदात्मार्थे परेष्वपकृतं त्वया।
तत्तदात्मनि सत्त्वार्थे व्यसनं विनिपातय।।१६५।।

In brief, whatever wrongs were done by you to other beings, make these faults descend on your own head for the benefit of beings.

One should always take upon one-self others' faults and keep one's own qualities in a low key. Give others the boost in praise and honour, give yourself the drubbing low-down even for your qualities. The self-soul being selfish to the core, not even the littlest of its qualities should ever be high-lighted nor should anybody know of its 'gunas' if any. Make it your privilege to do good to others by taking upon yourself the entire burden of their here-to-fore comitted faults, for that alone is the 'bodhi-mārga'.

नैवोत्साहोऽस्य दातव्यो येनायं मुखरो भवेत्।
स्थाप्यो नवबधूवृत्तौ ह्रीतो भीतोऽथ संवृतः।।१६६।।

166-170. Nor should it (i.e. your mind) be so encouraged that it becomes too vocal. Establish it in the mental attitude of a new bride,—bashful and restrained

एवंकुरुष्व तिष्ठैवं न कर्तव्यमिदं त्वया।
एवमेव वशः कार्यो निग्राह्यस्तदतिक्रमे।।१६७।।

(O Mind!)
Do like this and abide in it. This (i.e. self-ishness) should not be practised by you; it should be controlled and held fast with-

out allowing any transgression.

अथैवमुच्यमानेऽपि चित्तं नेदं करिष्यसि।
त्वामेव निग्रहीष्यामि सर्वदोषास्त्वदाश्रिताः ।।१६८।।

(O selfish mind!)
If you do not act accordingly after being so told, I shall certainly master you as all faults reside in you alone.

क्व यास्यसि मया दृष्टः सर्वदर्पान्निहन्मि ते।
अन्योऽसौ पूर्वकः कालस्त्वया यत्रास्मि नाशितः ।।१६९।।

(O mind!)
Where shall you go from under my eyes. I shall destroy all your ego. That was a previous age when I was ruined by you. (That is, now it is my turn to master you).

अद्याप्यस्ति मम स्वार्थ इत्याशां त्यज सांप्रतम्।
त्वं विक्रीतो मयान्येषु बहुखेदमचिन्तयन्।।१७०।।

(O selfish mind!)
Give up now all hope that even today you can have selfish aims. I have sold you to others without any serious regret (that is dedicated you to others' service).

How to establish supremacy over the mind? 'Sāntideva outlines various mental practices. Keep the profile of the mind low, shy, timid, hesitant like a newly-wed bride. Do not give any laxity or liberty much less unbridled license. Having yoked it to the service of others, keep a fine con-

trol over it and hold the reins tight. Gone are the days when the wayward mind had its will. Now, it must be forcibly kept under control so that it does not deviate from the goal assigned to it. In fact, its position is now that of a slave sold away as a permanent servant to the 'jagata' in order to do meritorious deeds for the sattvas.

त्वां सत्त्वेषु न दास्यामि यदि नाम प्रमोदतः।
त्वं मां नरकपालेषु प्रदास्यसि न संशयः।।१७१।।

171-175. If, out of laziness, I do not give you away (for the welfare of beings) I am sure you will hand me over to the guardians of hell.

एवं चानेकधा दत्वा त्वयाहं व्यथितश्चिरम्।
निहन्मि स्वार्थचेटं त्वां तानि वैराण्यनुस्मरन्।।१७२।।

By this (your handing me over to hells) I have long been tormented by you. Remembering all those enemies of mine, o selfish natured one! I shall destroy you.

न कर्तव्यात्मनि प्रीतिर्यद्यात्मप्रीतिरस्ति ते।
यद्यात्मा रक्षितव्योऽयं रक्षितव्यो न युज्यते।।१७३।।

If you have self-love for getting hapiness it should be abandoned, and, in order to avoid both the world and mokśa, give protection to others.

यथा यथास्य कायस्य क्रियते परिपालनम्।
सुकुमारतरो भूत्वा पतत्येव तथा तथा।।१७४।।

To the extent this body is nurtured and protected, to that degree it deteriorates by becoming more and more delicate.

अस्यैवं पतितस्यापि सर्वापीयं वसुन्धरा।
नालं पूरयितुं वांछां तत्कोऽस्येच्छां करिष्यति।।१७५।।

With the mind so fallen, even the whole earth will not suffice to fulfil its desires. Who else will satisfy its wish?

If the self-love of the mind is not converted into love for others, it is bound to play great mischief and even despatch you to the custody of 'naraka-pālas.' In fact, these tortures have already been your lot for many lives, which is all the more reason for destroying this self-love root and all. Only such a course will bring real peace and contentment. The more you care for the body, the more will its tentacles spread and tighten their grip. Then there will be no end to its frivolous demands and even the whole earth will not be able to cope with its wishes; it will become an implacable boss. Therefore, make it an obedient servant, instead.

अशक्यमिच्छतः क्लेश आशाभङ्गश्च जायते।
निराशो यस्तुसर्वत्र तस्य संपदजीर्णिका।।१७६।।

176-177. From unfulfilled desire will be born 'kleśa' and shattered hope. And, he who is ever bereft of hope is ever disconsolate and even his material wealth will prove harmful ('ajīranika') or unhealthy for him.

तस्मान्न प्रसरो देयः कायस्येच्छाभिवृद्धये।
भद्रकं नाम तद्वस्तु यदिष्टत्वान्न गृह्यते।।१७७।।

Therefore, no laxity should be given for the augmentation of bodily desires. Only that thing which is not accepted through desire can prove beneficent.

In the attempt to fulfil un-fulfillable desires, 'klesaś are bound to be generated. They will lead to suffering and grief and life would become hell. Therefore, the curbing of desires of the mind and the body must be made a daily exercise. Desirelessness is the only source of joy, peace and contentment.

भस्मनिष्ठावसानेयं निश्चेष्टान्येन चाल्यते।
अशुचिप्रतिमा घोरा कस्मादत्र ममाग्रहः।।१७८।।

178-182. (The body) has its final destiny as ashes and it is listlessly propelled by others. It is an unclean tabernacle. Why do I, then, so much cling to it?

किं ममानेन यन्त्रेण जीविना वा मृतेन वा।
लोष्टादेः को विशेषोऽस्य हाहंकारं न नश्यसि।।१७९।।

What use is this contraption to me whether alive or dead? What is special to it more than to a clod of earth? Oh, this ego will (still) not perish.

शरीरपक्षपातेन वृथा दुःखमुपार्ज्यते।
किमस्य काष्ठतुल्यस्य द्वेषेणानुनयेन वा।।१८०

In vain is suffering accumulated by favouring (the desires of the body). What use is anger or supplication in the case of one which is like a piece of wood?

मया वा पालितस्यैवं गृध्राद्यैर्भक्षितस्य वा।
न च स्नेहो न च द्वेषस्तत्र स्नेहं करोमि किम्।।१८१।।

Its (i.e. the body's) being so nurtured by me or its being devoured by vultures etc. makes it experience neither attachment nor envy. Why, then, should I have attachment for it?

रोषो यस्य खलीकारात्तोषो यस्य च पूजया।
स एव चेन्न जानाति श्रमः कस्य कृतेन मे।।१८२।।

That (i.e. the body) does not feel angry when derided nor contented when praised. For whom is all this ado by me, then?

One need not have all that attachment to the body, because the body by itself is listless. It is the mind that moves it into activity. And, its final end is only the dust of the grave. Why shower so much care on such a toy of useless clay? All ego connected with the body should be abandoned. Nor can the body feel love or hatred which are aberrations of the mind only. Hence, why should such mean feelings be harboured for the sake of the body? The body being 'achetana' or inert cannot visualise things like loss or gain, joy or sorrow, insult or praise. Why should, then, the mind be attached to these feelings for the sake of the inert body?

इमं ये कायमिच्छन्ति तेऽपि मे सुहृदः किल।
सर्वे स्वकायमिच्छन्ति तेऽपि कस्मान्नमे प्रियाः।।१८३।।

183-184. But even those who love this (my) body, are verily my friends. All people love their bodies. Why are they not, then, equally dear to me?

तस्मान्मयानपेक्षेण कायस्त्यक्तो जगिद्धिते।
अतोऽयं बहुदोषोऽपि धार्यतेकर्म भाण्डवत्।।१८४।।

Hence, for the sake of the world, this body will be given up by me without any attachment and, in spite of its many drawbacks, borne as a cloister for work (or a tabernacle for action).

We consider them friends who praise our physique or the contours of our body and call it handsome and well-built. Well, so do all people love their bodies. Ipso facto, they too should be called our friends if those others who love my one body are friends. Even though, as explained earlier, the body is a mere clod of earth, it has a redeeming side too. It is to be maintained for being of service to others. It is an instrument of work; it can be sacrificed for the welfare of beings.

तेनालं लोकचरितैः पंडिताननुयाम्यहम्।
अप्रमादकथां स्मृत्वा स्त्यानमिद्धं निवारयन्।।१८५।।

185-186. So, enough of following the world. I shall (now) follow the wise ones, remembering the instructions given (by them) about effort (apramāda) and about warding off

sleep and indolence.

तस्मादावरणं हन्तुं समाधानं करोम्यहम्।
विमार्गाच्चित्तमाकृष्य स्वालम्बननिरंतरम्।।१८६।।

Therefore, in order to destroy the 'āvaraṇa' or the crust of illusion, I shall practise equipoise by dissuading my mind from the wrong path and constantly relying on self-effort on the true path.

Whatever foolish or fruitless worldly practices may have been pursued till now, need to be completely abandoned. Relying on the methods suggested by the wise ancients, efforts should be made to give up lethargy, inertia and lassitude. Courage and entnusiam for work should be cultivated. The mind should be still for attaining samādhi by destroying the five-fold superficial covering which hinders meditation or 'dhyāna'. The mind should be taken off the wrong track and brought on to the path of 'samyakasambodhi' through 'vipaśyanā'.

IX—Prajnā-Pārmitā

PERFECTION OF WISDOM

This chapter presents a critique of the doctrines of other schools of thought and an elucidation of the doctrine of 'śunyatā'. The commentator, Prajnākarmati, treats the IXth chapter as an independent work and, before commencing his commentary on the chapter, he writes an invocation in verse in three stanzas of four lines each. The invocation is as under:

"I, after bowing to it in the prescribed manner, do hereby expostulate it with delightful verses,— (she, 'Prajna') which is being continuously (anāsrava) preached with 'samvriti' verses of Prajna-Parmita etc; which is free from all falsehood being unattached and 'niruttar-padam'; practising (pratipādya') which people with unblemished intelligence or refined intellect ('nirmala dhiyo') attain higher realms (uttamām gatim').

Whereas of this treasure of virtues Ācharya Śāntideva can speak with clarity,-he who has crossed the great ocean of discourse or speech ('pravachana-mahāmbodhi')-why do I, a stupid fool, desire to explain him? Even so, I am engaged in this even and good task through the practice of Prajnā.

I do not posses even an iota of virtue ('guna') nor intelligence born of the quality of accumulated brilliance. Even then my tongue crawls ('prati-sarpati') as much as

the fruit of faith in kalyamitras i.e. bodhisattvas."

The sanskrit version contains the following insertions before the introductory stanzas of the chapter: Aūm loka-pālāye namah, Aūm lokeśāye namah. However, these are omitted in the Tibetan version which, instead, contains the following: Āum Manjuśriye kumārabhūtāye namah.

इमं परिकरं सर्वं `प्रज्ञार्थं हि मुनिर्जगौ।
तस्मादुत्पादयेत्प्रज्ञां दुःखनिवृत्तिकांक्षया।।१।।

1. The Muni (i.e. Lord Buddha) spoke of all this set (of practices) for the sake of (the cultivation) of wisdom or 'prajña'. Therefore, with the desire of removing 'dukha', one should generate 'prajña'.

Of all the perfections, this one of prajña' or wisdom is supreme. In fact, it is the apex of the pyramid, the acme of all perfections enumerated hereto-fore. Charity or dana' is the first step to 'sambodhi' as it accumulates merit. Then, there is 'śīla' or noble conduct, an ornament on the road to higher realms or 'sugati'. It also leads to the achievement of higher knowledge. Next comes for-bearance or 'kśānti' which, after overcoming contrary factors and maintaining the accumulation of merit earned through 'dāna' and 'śīla' leads to 'sugatattva' or the attainment of a higher realm in the next birth. The three-fold accumulation of 'dāna', 'śīla' and 'kśānti is unattainable without the cultivation of 'veerya-parmitā'

For a person of balanced mind, with the dawn of the knowledge of the reality of all phenomena ('yathā-bhūta jñanam), is born what may be called 'jnāna-parmita' or

perfection of knowledge for the sake of higher understanding or 'annutara jnāna'. However-much 'dana' etc. are practised, they alone cannot lead to bodhisattva-hood or 'sugata-pada' without prajña' which alone refines the mind. To enter the road of bodhi, enter the road of budhi, enter the city of 'sarvākarajntā';

"When, o kaushika, the five 'pārmitās' are led by 'prajña-pārmita', they attain eyes or vision. Only then they are called 'pārmitās'."

Now what is 'prjña', after all? It is defined as

यथावस्थितप्रतीत्यसमुत्पन्न-वस्तुतत्त्वप्रविचय लक्षणा।

i.e. one that knows the reality or truth behind the apparent layer or superficial aspect of all phenomena. It can differentiate between the 'samvriti' and the 'paramārtha' levels of truth.

How is 'prajña born? It is born through refinement of the mind with self-control or 'śamatha' like the growth of harvest in a well cultivated field, 'śamatha' generates 'vipaśyanā' or what is also termed 'yatha-bhuta śakti', i.e. the power to understand the real state of all phenomena. It has been said in 'Dharma-sangīti': "The man of balanced mind has 'yatha-bhuta-darśanam'. This knowledge of the truth behind all phenomena generates 'mahā-karunā' for sentient beings. So augment, augment prajña".

According to the commentator, Prajnākaramati, even 'prajña' is of two types, 'hetu-bhūta' and 'Phala-bhūta',-that born of cause and that born of effect. The causal one, in turn, is also of two types, one belonging to a person desirous of release or 'mukti' ('adhi-mukti charitāh'), the other to a bodhisattva who has attained the 'bhumis' ('bhumi-praviśtāh). The effect-born or 'phala-bhūta' pra-

jnā makes one realise the non-soul in all things, leading to a comprehensive feeling of void or 'śunyatā'.

Hence, all that Lord Buddha has said or preached aims at providing guidelines for the attainment of wisdom ('prajnā) of 'śunyatā-jnāna' or the realisations of voidness. 'Prajña' alone, through the aid of various other 'pārmitās', can remove 'kleśāvarana' and jneyāvarana', -the supperficial layers of 'kleśas' and ignorance. This is extremely essential for generating 'bodhichitta' and for attaining 'buddhattva', as the bodhisattva's aim is to remove the 'dukha' of all sentient beings.

But, 'dāna' etc. are also called as qualities governed by wisdom or 'prajña' pradhāna gunāh.' Why? Because, the practising of those perfections also requires an element of wisdom. It is wisdom to know that 'dāna' or charity depends on three factors,- the giver, the given and the receiver. The proper combination of these three refines the mind and, with constant practice, coupled with humility, growing higher and better, shorn of all illusion (āvarana) created by ignorance, released from 'kleśa-varna' or the superficial crust imposed by 'kleśas', the mind attaining a state of 'nairātamya' or non-self-ness and dedicating everything to the welfare of sattvas, one attains the 'dharma-kāya' of Tathagata which is 'para-mārtha-tattvātmaka' i.e. in essence ultimate truth or the truth of 'śunyata'. Thus, in all this process, beginning with 'dāna-pārmita', the prominent factor is 'prajña', alone. Hence other perfections are only the 'parikara' or mere 'sambhār', i.e. the collection or stock of a kind of raw-material for the final aim of 'prajña-pārmitā'.

Some may ask: "If 'prajnā' is all superior and the prime means to achieve 'sambodhi', of what use are other 'pārmitās'? Why has Lord Buddha termed them as mere 'parikara' for 'prajnā'?" Well, the other perfections are like

netra-vikalāh' i.e. they are 'by sight confused'. They cannot totally pierce the layer of 'pratitya-samutapāda'. In order to attain bodhisattva-hood the 'netra-vikalah' must become 'prajnā-netrakāh' or 'wisdom eye' or the seeing eyes. Prajnā-pārmitā-stava says:

सर्वपारमिताभिस्त्वं निर्मलाभिरनिन्दिते।
चन्द्रलेखेव ताराभिरनुयातासि सर्वदा।।

The Lord, in Śata-sahasra prajnā-parimitā says: "Just as, O Subhūta! the sun and the moon do their work in the four continents, so also 'prajnāpārmitā' works in the five 'pārmitās,' follows the five 'pārmitās'. The five 'pārmitās' are not 'parmitās' worth the name without 'prajnā-pārmitā',. So also, O Subhūta! whatever the dirty streams, they all merge into the river Ganga. So also, O Subhuta! the five 'pārmitās' follow the same course as the Ganga of prajnāpārmitā".
And again:

"O Kaushika! 'prajñapārmitā' supersedes the 'daśa-pārmitās' in the Great Beings (the bodhisattvas), it supersedes 'dānapārmitā', it supersedes 'śīlapārmitā', it supersedes 'kśanti-pārmitā', it supersedes' 'veerya-pārmitā', it supersedes 'dhyāna-pārmitā'. Just as for hundreds and thousands of blind persons, O Kaushika! some guide is necessary to enter the correct road for a city, so also, O Kaushika! the eyeless five pārmitās are guided by the seeing eye of 'prajnā-pārmitā' as they, by themselves, are unfit to enter the road of bodhi, to reach the city of 'sarva-kārjnatā..... When, 'O Kaushika! the five Pārmitās are led by 'Prjnāpārmitā they attain vision. Only then they are fit to be called Pārmitāś.

संवृतिः परमार्थश्च सत्यद्वयमिदं मतम्।
बुद्धेरगोचरस्तत्त्वं बुद्धिः संवृतिरुच्यते।।२।।

2. Two types of truths are recognised: 'samvritti' and 'parmartha'! Reality or 'tattva' being unattainable by intelligence is called the 'samvritti' or deception of intelligence.

There are, for argument's sake, two levels of the perception of all phenomena: the deceptive and the ultimate. Literally, 'samvritti' means 'that which hides, covers up or envelopes'. What does it cover up? It camouflages the true knowledge of reality or 'yathā-bhūta-parijñanam' with the cover of the so-called nature of self or 'svabhāva' of things; it brings into bold relief only that which is the false outer crust. It is, in fact, the synonym of delusion and ignorance. It is ignorance which invests unreal objects with a vesture of reality and a veil of individual identity or 'samvritti'. It gives meaning to the non-existent and, being born of ignorance, its nature is like that of a person of libidinous inclination:

अभूतं ख्यापयत्यर्थं भूतमावृत्म वर्तते।
अविद्या जायमानैव कामलातङ्कवृत्तिवत।।

What is 'parmārtha satya'? Literally, the word means 'the best meaning or the best aims', or that which reveals the true nature of objects. What is this true nature of things? It is what is termed as 'sarva-dharmāṇām nissvabhavatāh', 'śunyatā', 'tathatā', 'bhūtakoti', 'dharma-dhātu' etc. One must attempt to probe behind the veil of 'samvritti' to attain 'paramārtha' and argue with oneself as suggested in the following verses:

मायया निर्मितं यच्च हेतुभिर्यच्चनिर्मितम्।
आयाति तत्कुतः कुत्र याति चेति निरुप्यताम्।।

यदन्यसंनिधानेन दृष्टं न तदभावतः।
प्रतिबिम्बसमे तस्मिन् कृत्रिमे सत्यता कथम्।।

Although all phenomena is without cause ('ahetutāh') but, due to varying combinations and permutations of apparent causes, different phenomena appear like varied reflections in a prism. However, in their essence 'nissvabhāvāh ami svabhāvāh tattvatā'; that is, all thoughts are without thoughts. So it is said that the thoughts of the wise do not spring from any manifest cause either for themselves or for others or for both.

Actually, these two 'satyas' or truths are only the two sides of the same coin but they have been given two different nomenclatures on account of the two differing levels of perception. Thus have all the Buddhas of illumined minds, their followers of the Path, the śravakas, the Pratyeka-buddhas and the bodhisattvas accepted these two 'satyas' in order that the truth becomes easily intelligible to common people through this practical approach to all phenomena:

द्वे सत्ये समुपाश्रित्य बुद्धानां धर्मदेशना।
लोके-संवृतिसत्यं च सत्यं च परमार्थतः।।

It has also been re.iterated in the 'Pitā-putra samā-gama-sutra':

सत्य इमे दुवि लोकविदूनां
दिष्ट स्वयं अश्रुणित्व परेषाम्।
संवृति या च तथा परमार्थो
सत्यु न सिध्यति किं च तृतीयु।।

Now arises a question and a very pertinent one: what about the basic and fundamental stipulation by Lord Buddha about the four Great truths or 'chattvarīnī ārya-sātyanī' in the 'abhidharma'. How come there are only two 'satyas' now? Well, there need be no misapprehen-

sion on this score. The four 'āryasatyas' too are included within this two-fold compass of the 'samvritti, and the 'paramartha'. 'Dukha', 'samudaya' and 'mārga'- these are included in the 'samvritti and 'nirodha' is included in the 'paramārtha', because it leads to the true perception of reality.

Another moot question; how can 'samvritti' be termed a 'satya' or truth when it comprises an ignorance of vision which tends to create an illusion of is-ness where nothing is and that too in myriads of forms? Well, it is so termed only in terms of common-place parlance. Lord Buddha termed it so in order to make the common people understand what he wanted them to understand-'paramārtha-satya'. Actually, there is only one truth, i.e. 'paramārtha' which, of course, is not manifest to the ordinary mind. To make this unmanifest manifest, the manifest unmanifest is used as a peg to hang on as a convenient and handy prop. So the negation of 'samvritti' becomes 'paramartha'.

The commentator, Prajñakarmati, cites a very plausible instance in illustration of the difference between 'samvritti' and 'paramārtha'. A person who suffers from total darkness of sight (a 'taimrika) looks up at the sky, rotating his eyes this way and that way and only finds it full of dark net-like apparitions and hair buns. Seeing him so doing another person, who does not suffer from that ailment but can see well, wonders as to what he is doing. Approaching him the latter finds that he cannot even decipher the colour or form of his own hair falling over his eyes nor can he imagine what or what not his own hair are like. When the one blind of sight expresses his idea to the seeing one that he only sees hair all around, the latter, in order to counter his illusion, retorts: "no, it is not hair that you see." Even this does not convince the blind man. The conclusion is that the dark of sight can

never see the fact of the hair as the one with sight can. Similarly, foolish people, unaware of the reality owing to the darkness of ignorance, see only such non-existing forms as 'skandha', 'dhātu', 'āyatana etc. This is their samvritti-form. So also, the manner in which the Buddha and bodhisattvas, shorn of all ignorance or 'avidyā', look at these things, is the 'para-mārtha' form of 'satya'. Thus it is through 'vyavāhara satya' or common-place truth alone that ultimate truth can be explained.

अनक्षरस्य धर्मस्य श्रुतिः का देशना च का।
श्रूयते देश्यते चार्थः समारोपादनक्षरः।।

व्यवहारमनागम्य परमार्थो न देश्यते।
परमार्थमनागम्य निर्वाणं नाधिगम्यते।।

तत्र लोको द्विधा दृष्टो योगी प्राकृतकस्तथा।
तत्र प्राकृतको लोको योगिलोकेन बाध्यते।।३।।

3. Now, these (two types of truth) are seen by two types of persons: the 'yogi' and the common man. Therein are the 'prakritas' or common people contradicted by the yogis.

Humanity can be broadly divided into two categories, people who see and people who do not see, that is, those who understand the 'paramārtha satya' and those who know only the 'samvritti satya'. The 'yogi' is one who understands the true nature of all phenomena. Such people are a category apart. The 'prākritika is one whose mind is merely centred on the ephemeral phenomena of the world and is, in consequence thereof, ruled by desire, ignorance, envy and greed. Such people too are a category apart. The one is enlightened, the other suffers from the delusion of ignorance. These of the latter sort constitute the common mass of people whose virtues are over-

shadowed by the dust-haze of ignorance. They cannot but take a superficial view of things. Their ignorance and darkness can be washed clean only by the water of knowledge. Such knowledge is the yogi's possession who confronts the cloudy 'āvarana' of 'samvritti' with the sun-light of the 'paramārtha' as realised by him. For example, the common people think the body to be a unit, the mind to be permanent and so forth. The yogis, however, contradict these reasonings like this; "the body is not a unit, because it has many parts and the mind is not permanent, because it changes into something else". Thus, it is the ignorance of the common people which is contradicted by the knowledge of the yogis. The un-intelligent intelligence of the common man is its own obstacle. The wisdom of intelligence is the yogi's saving grace.

बाध्यन्ते धीविशेषेण योगिनोऽप्युत्तरोत्तरैः ।
दृष्टान्तेनोभयेष्टेन कार्यार्थमविचारतः । ।४ । ।

4. Even the 'yogis' are contradicted, progressively one by the other, with (the exercise of) super-intelligence, through instances from both sides and unmindful of the main objective (which is the attainment of 'buddhattva')

Not only do the 'yogis' contradict or criticise the common people but, in among themselves, those of one belief criticise those of other beliefs. Look at the differences among the Vaibhaśikas, the Sautrāntikas, the Sarvastivādins, the Chitta-mātrins, the Mādhymikas etc. With intelligence and its fineries better exercised in probing the mysteries of existence and in finding out the ultimate truth, higher and more incisive arguments come forth in support of new deductions and fresh interpretations. It is only through such exercise that the 'dhi' or intellect gets more and more refined for flights into

inner space. 'Dhyāna' and samādhi' also aid this process of refinement; for example, even a bodhisattva can only attain the second or 'vimalā bhūmi' after the first or 'pramuditā bhūmi' through his 'jñana-prabhāva' or the influence of realised knowledge. So also is the onward progress from one 'bhūmi' or level to the other. Thus are the 'sāsravas' contradicted by 'anāsravas' and those of unrefined or 'asamskritā' dharmas by those of refined or 'samskrita' dharmas. Each side cites its own accepted instances and syllogisms to prove its point of view. Such examples as the 'magician's 'illusion' or 'the serpent for the rope' are given by both sides and are accepted as unreal by both owing to all phenomena being basically 'nissvabhāva'. Thus it is proved that, although something may appear as real to those who only look at external forms, it may not have to be real to lead the yogi to his 'paramārtha satya'. So, in both cases, there is an element of deception or illusion owing to the mystery of contradictory forms or 'viparītavastu rūpa-guhyatā'. If the minds of the common people are deceptive, the minds of the yogis may be equally so, relatively speaking, the common denominator for everybody's perception being that all phenomena is not truly existent. However, this stipulation gives rise to a pertinent question: If all phenomena is not truly existent, why should bodhisattvas engage themselves in such virtuous pursuits as 'dāna' etc? The answer is: 'because of such activity also being 'nisvabhāva', that is, such practices (for attaining 'bodhichitta') should be practised unhesitatingly for the purpose for which they are meant'. In this case, there is no objection to 'hetuphala', because such practises help the generation of 'paramārtha bhāva! Therefore, not bothering about the basic, fundamental of 'pratitya-samutpāda' of one's belief, one should continue to engage in such practices with the avowed object: 'well, such and such practice will produce such and such result'. Then will the practice or 'upéyatva' of the means

of 'upāya' become beneficiaı.

उपायभूतं व्यवहारसत्समुपेयभूतं परमार्थसत्यम्।

Therefore, the performance of wholesome karma like 'dāna' etc. is strongly recommėnded for wholesome results.

लोकेन भावा दृश्यन्ते कल्प्यन्ते चापि तत्त्वतः।
न तु मायावदित्यत्र विवादो योगिलोकयोः।।५।।

5. The common people see forms and even imagine them to be real. They do not regard them as illusions. Therein lies the dispute between them and the yogis.

The difference between the common man and the yogi is one of perception alone whereas each observes the same phenomena. What is meant by 'bhāvas'? They assume a form only in consequence of a certain conceptual cause, although the word 'bhāva' indicates a lack of formal existence. In any case, the 'bhāvas' have no 'paramārthika' or ultimate form or entity other than what they superficially appear to the common people. To the 'yogis' they appear as mere illusion, shorn of any real existence, In fact, all 'bhāvas' too have two forms; the 'samvritta' and the 'paramārthika'. The common people can see only the first, the yogis only the second. People under the spell of a magician's mantra, their vision enthralled by the illusion, see only the form of the elephant created by the magician's illusion, but the magician himself understands the truth behind all his performance. So are the common people and the yogis divergent in their outlook on all phenomena.

प्रत्यक्षमपि रुपादि प्रसिद्ध्या न प्रमाणतः ।
अशुच्यादिषु शुच्यादिप्रसिद्धिरिव सा मृषा ।।६ ।।

6. Whatever forms etc. appear as apparent do so owing to customary concepts and not due to any 'pramāna' or (real) proof. This is as false as to believe impure things to be pure.

Most of the people have an absolutely superficial and illusory cognition of things because of some traditionally accepted mores of society. These customary concepts have become a part of the social psyche. They do not allow the 'tāttvic' or real truth of things to dawn on the mind, as the apparent or 'samvritta' forms apear so palpably manifest. Thus the real cognition of 'rūpa', 'vedanā' etc. remains out of the common person's reach. Well, if reality could be known through senses fools would have become 'tattva-jñanis' or knowers of reality. Even the obvious cannot be realised through proof or 'pramāna', what then of that which is hidden behind the veil of illusion? Most perceptions are merely born of conventional perceptions and therefore unfit for a valid cognition of the ultimate truth. The unclean body of a woman is deceptively recognised as clean and attractive, which is really a false cognition of the ultimate truth of the body. So are all 'rūpas' or forms.

Now, a question may be asked as to how it was that Lord Buddha spoke of all things having a momentary existence when, actually, all phenomena have no existence at all? The answer is that the master made such a stipulation to the extent that he was aware of the merely apparent nature of such phenomena as traditionally believed by the common people. He took their very belief as the denominator to exppound his own teachings. If reality cannot b discovered out of apparent 'pramāna' or proof, it can be through āgama or the word of the mas-

er. Thus he instructed in the Sutra about the momenary nature of phenomena as affected by 'skandha,' dhātu' and 'āyatana' etc. and named them five, eighteen and twelve in that order:

क्षणिकाः सर्वसंस्कारा अस्थिराणां कुतः क्रिया।
भूतिर्यैषां क्रिया सैव कारकं सैव चोच्यते।।

The five Heaps or skandhas are, 'rūpa' or form, 'vedanā' or feeling, 'samjña' or cognition, 'samskāra' or volitional formations of mental co-efficients and vijñana' or consciousness. The twelve Āyatanas' or Entrances are: eye, ears, nose, tongue, body, form, sound, smell, taste touch, mind and mental (entrance). The eighteen 'dhātūs' or Elements are:

eye element,
ear element,
nose element
tongue element
body element
form element
sound element
smell element
taste element
touch element
mind element
mental element
mind consciousness element
eye consciousness element
ear consciousness element
nose consciousness element
tongue element
body consciousness element

Note that the five Heaps include all conditioned dharmas, the twelve Entrances include both conditioned and unconditioned dharmas and the eighteen Elements include all knowable dharmas.

लोकावतारणार्थं हि भावा नाथेन देशिताः।
तत्त्वतः क्षणिका नैते संवृत्या चेद्विरुध्यते।।७।।

7. Such ideas were taught by the Lord for the sake of guiding people gradually (to the path). In the

ultimate sense, such phenomena are not momentary but only in the sense of 'samvritti': hence the contradiction.

In order to make those who are underserving of instruction in 'śunyatā' as deserving of it, Lord Buddha spoke of things as transitory and momentary so that they could be gradually brought on to the realisation of reality and to the ultimate understanding of all phenomena. Although the phenomena are without existence, but with a view to saving beings from the dukha of hells and bringing about their welfare, aware of the need of the common people, Lord Buddha taught such ideas. In the ultimate analysis, such phenomena are not momentary. It is said in the 'yukti-pushtikā':

ममेत्यहमिति प्रोक्तं यथा कार्यवशाज्जनैः ।
तथा कार्यवशात्प्रोक्ताः स्कन्धायतनधातवः ।।

Just as people say 'this is mine', 'this is I' merely for practical purposes of communication, so also, as a practical measure, are mentioned 'skandhas, 'āyatanas' and 'dhātūs'.

न दोषो योगिसंवृत्या लोकात् ते तत्त्वदर्शिनः
अन्यथा लोकबाधा स्याद् अशुचिस्त्रीनिरूपणे ।।८।।

8. As the yogis are the seers of ultimate reality, no blame accrues to them from the 'samvritti' view of the common people. Otherwise, there can be contradiction also from the common people in the matter of regarding a woman as unclean (who in their eyes is clean).

The argument that actually things do not exist even

momentarily or that no phenomena is even momentary but occurs only deceptively to common or ignorant people, may attract the objection: 'Why call it even deceptive when it neither actually exists nor does it appear so to the common people'? Actually, no real contradiction is involved here. That which appears as 'samvritti' to the yogis who have experienced a state of non-self or identity-less-ness through 'samādhi' and 'pudgala' is so because of its momentary nature. The 'kśnikattva' or momentariness which comes with the yogi's vision is not granted to the ordinary people. The yogis are the seers of reality. Therefore, they alone and not others can see the 'samvritta' side of phenomena; they alone can look beyond the compass of physical senses; they are 'atindriya-darśanāh'. Just as they can visualise reality so can they the momentariness of all phenomena. Their vision is not hampered by 'loka-pratīti' or the conventional view of things. This postulate has to be accepted otherwise a yogi's comprehension of a woman's body as unclean would be in contradiction with the conventional view of its being 'śuchi' or clean. But, because the yogi's comprehension is not hampered by the conventional view of things, he sees it in its true reality as unclean. Hence it must be granted that all phenomena are fundamentally illusory and dream-like: 'māyā-svapnādi-svabhavāh sarvadharmāh'. This alone constitutes the yogi's true comprehension of reality.

Sceptics may well pose a further question:, 'If all is illusion, is not even the Buddha illusory and dream-like?' Listen to the answer Subhuti gave when confronted with a similar querry: "O ďevaputra! all things are illusory; all things are dream-like. Illusions and beings or things are inseparable. O devaputra! all phenomena are illusory and dream-like or 'srotāpannā' and the fruits of 'srotāpatti' are illusory and dream-like: the 'arhata' and his 'arhatattva' are dream-like and illusory; so also is the

'pratyeka-buddha' and 'pra-budhatta' and the 'samyaka sambuddha and samyaka-sambuddhattva.' Because nirvana is also illusory and dream-like, anything which may be superior to nirvana itself is, I say, equally illusory and dream-like."

मायोपमाज्जिनात्पुण्यं सद्भावेऽपि कथं यथा।
यदि मायोपमः सत्त्वः किं पुनर्जायते मृतः।।९।।

9. If everything is illusory, what merit can accrue from homage and reverence to the jinas (or what demerit from irreverence)? If a 'sattva' is illusory, how is it reborn after death?

This śloka contains two questions, both born of the concept of illusoriness of all phenomena. If the Buddhas and the jinas are also illusory, what 'punya' can result from worshipping or paying homage to them? And, what 'pāpa' or sin is there in not revering them? A being which is born of a 'māyā-kāra' or magician's illusion is neither worthy of respect or disrespect nor capable of generating merit or demerit. How can merit accrue from such worship in the context of 'paramārtha'. Isn't it foolish to talk of merit or demerit or of virtue and sin resulting from reverence or otherwise for beings who are dream-like, illusory? The answer is the same as before: truly existent merits flow from worshipping a truly existent jina in the same way as illusory merits flow from worshipping an illusory jina. He for whom the conqueror is a 'paramārtha sata' to him accrues 'paramārtha sata punya;' to another only illusion-like merit accrues from an illusory jina. The argument, posed in the question, cuts both ways. There is no 'paramārtha-sata' form of things which could be established by 'yukti' or argument.

Now, the second question, if a being is 'māyā'-like or

illusory, who is then reborn after death? Because, a 'māyā-pursuśa' or an illusory being cannot be recreated after being once destroyed. The answer to this question is furnished in the next śloka.

यावत्प्रत्ययसामग्री तावन्मायापि वर्तते।
दीर्घसंतानमात्रेण कथं सत्त्वोऽस्ति सत्यतः ।।१०।।

10. Illusion will persist for so long as the necessary material to generate it exists. Why should a sentient being appear more real (than an illusion) only because of its longer span (of existence)?

So long as there are the 'pratyayas' like anger, greed, lust and envy, which constitute the raw material for the generation of 'sattvas'-the 'māyā' or illusion of sentient beings, of their death and birth, will continue. Although illusions are unreal too but they are palpably similar to 'sattvas' because they also arise from conditions or 'partyayas'. Why should, then, a sentient being be regarded as something more real than they only because he has a longer span of existence and procreation? Both being illusions, are longer-lasting illusions more realistic than those of shorter duration? That which has material (sāmagri) or condition enough to make it last for a longer time will surely last longer than that which has material to make it last for a short duration. Thus, it all depends on 'pratyaya' or conditions and not on one being real and the other being imaginary.

मायापुरुषघातादौ चित्ताभावान्न पापकम्।
चित्तमायासमेते तु पापपुण्यसमुद्भवः ।।११।।

11. There is no sin in killing a 'māyā- puruśha' or

illusory person because he is devoid of 'chitta' or a conscious mind. But, in the case of a 'laukika pursha' or a sentient person, virtue and sin accrue as he is endowed with a conscious mind.

As the 'chitta' or mind is associated with illusion, it alone can generate virtue and vice, 'pāpa' and 'punya'. A sentient person, even though illusion-like, is endowed with a conscious mind or 'chetanā'. One's conduct towards him, therefore, is capable of generating merit and demerit, the instrument for such conduct being the illusory mind itself. To kill such a being would constitute a sin. This could be the answer to the querry: 'If the whole world is illusory, why is homicide considered as sinful?

मंत्रादीनामसामर्थ्यान्न मायाचित्तसंभवः।
सापि नानाविधा माया नानाप्रत्ययसंभवा।
नैकस्य सर्वसामर्थ्यं प्रत्ययस्यास्ति कुत्र चित्।।१२।।

12. Incantations etc. are incapable of producing the illusory mind ('māyā-chitta). Different illusions arise from a variety of differing conditions.

Mantras and spells and herbal, medicinal and other charms are capable of producing illusion but they, for sure, cannot produce the illusory mind. The magician's horses and elephants are illusory creations though looking life-like; but they lack one thing, 'māyā-chitta'. Varied and innumerable are the 'pratyas' or conditions which produce varying types of innumerable illusions. No one 'pratyaya' by itself has the power to produce all types of illusions; no single cause can at any stage or time be so

powerful as to produce all the effects. So, illusions vary as the conditions or causes of their orgin do.

निवृत्तः परमार्थेन संवृत्या यदि संसरेत्।
बुद्धोऽपि संसरेदेवं ततः किं बोधिचर्यया।।१३।।

13. If, in terms of 'paramartha' or ultimate truth, 'nirvāna' lies only in 'svabhava-śunyatā' or total voidness of self, while deceptively passing through cyclic existence, what avail is bodhicharyā when even the realised one ('Buddha') or the bodhisattva has to pass through the same cycle?

The Mādhyamikas believe that, in the final analysis and in the context of 'paramārtha', neither samsara' nor 'nirvana' exists. To be in a constant state of non-self voidness, while passing through the mill of cyclic existence, is real emancipation. Doesn't this provide a contradiction to conclude that, likewise, the Buddhas or the bodhisattvas also have to pass through the rounds of cyclic existence life after life? Of what use is it for a bodhisattva, then, to practise the hard and severe bodhicharyā vows? What with the sacrifices of life and limb and extreme self-abnegation he has to undergo in various births in order to reach bodhi-sattva-hood? Doubts such as these are clarified by the author in the next śloka.

प्रत्ययानामनुच्छेदे मायाप्युच्छिद्यते न हि।
प्रत्ययानां तु विच्छेदात् संवृत्यापि न संभवः।।१४।।

14. If the conditions are not destroyed, 'māyā' or illusion is also not destroyed. With the destruction of 'pratyayas' or conditions, even 'samvritti' or unreal concepts are not born.

In order to destroy illusions, the conditions reponsible for generating them must be uprooted. This can be done through constant effort alone. Ignorance, greed, envy, hatred etc. must be totally eradicated lest illusions get a fertile breeding ground for their unwholesome breed to germinate. The Śalistamba sutra mentions the following upadeśa of the Lord as conveyed to blessed Sariputra by Bodhisattva Maitreya: The all-knowing Lord, the Master of Dharma said: 'o bhikshus, he who sees 'pratitya-samutpāda', he sees dharma; he who sees dharma, he sees Buddha. And, what is 'pratitya-samutpāda'? It is the 'samskāra' of 'avidyā pratyaya' or the conditions of ignorance. The condition of 'samskāra', is 'vijnāna', the condition of 'vijnāna' is 'nāma-rūpa' or name and form, the condition or 'pratyaya' of 'nāma-rūpa is 'shadāyatana', the condition of 'shadāyatana' is 'sparsha' or touch, the condition of 'sparsha' is 'vedạnā' or consciousness, the 'pratyaya' of 'vedanā' is 'trśnā' or desire, the condition of 'trśnā' is greed, that of greed is existence or 'bhava', the condition of 'bhava' is 'jāti' or birth, the conditions of 'jāti' are the grief from age, death and the sorrow and pain of hatred. Thus is there for a person a whole mass of dukha. When ignorance is overcome, samskaras are overcome, this mass of dukha is overcome. This is called 'pratitya samutpāda'. He who sees this 'pratiya samutpāda' as lifeless, unbecoming, unborn, non-existent, ugly, unreliable, un-frightening, not inevitable and capable of being overpowered he sees dharma."

The sèntient beings continue to float in cyclic existence because they do not eradicate the conditions or causes leading to that state. Lord Buddha having destroyed the conditions of cyclic existence and having overcome all illusion, does not belong to cyclic existence even deceptively.

यदा न भ्रान्तिरप्यस्ति माया केनोपलभ्यते ।।१५।।

15-16. If there is no deceptiveness either, how would illusion be discerned? (so questions the Vijnānavādi).

यदा मायैव ते नास्ति तदा किमुपलभ्यते।
चित्तस्यैव स आकारो यद्यप्यन्योऽस्ति तत्त्वतः ।।१६।।

If you do not believe in 'māyā' or illusion, what do you grasp or arrive at (through 'buddhi)? It will be the same as 'chitta' or mind (and hence none to discriminate between the seen and the seer), although in reality it is different (so answers the madhyamika).

From now onward is a rebuttal of the views of vijnānvādis from the point of view of the Mādhyamikas. The Vijnānavādi questions: "If there were no deceptiveness or illuaory nature of the mind wherefrom would spring 'buddhi' or discriminating intellect to discern 'māyā' or illusion?"

The 'Mādhyamika' replies, "you cannot even distantly think of an interpretation of dharma based on illusoriness of things, because you do not understand the real meaning of 'nissvabhāva'. You think it to mean as something even shorn of illusoriness, which is wrong. Therefore, you cannot discriminate between illusion and reality, lacking as you do the 'buddhi' to do so. Self-cognition or a non-deceived aspect of the mind will never help in the cognition of illusion-like appearances of things. The view that only the 'chitta' or mind truly exists and no external objects, and that whatever forms of external objects posit themselves before the mind are nothing but 'chitta' itself is fallacious, because what has the mind to grasp if it does not possess the nature of discriminating

between the real and the illusory? It being the beholder, what will it behold? As there is nothing seen, where is the seer either?"

चित्तमेव यदा माया तदा किं केन दृश्यते।।
उक्तं हि लोकनाथेन चित्तं न पश्यति।।
न च्छिनत्ति यथात्मानमसिधारा तथा मनः।।१७।।

17. If mind itself is 'māyā', what beholds what? It has been said by Lord Buddha that the mind does not see the mind. Just as a sword blade cannot cut itself so cannot the mind (know itself).

The Mādhyamika questions, "well, if mind itself is 'māyā what is the function of 'buddhi' or intellect in discrimination?" The Vijnānvādi would reply: "The mind is self-introspective and there is distinction between the seer and the seen. The mind is both there." The Madhyamika retorts, "your stipulation contradicts 'āgma' or the word of Lord Buddha. The mind cannot know itself just as the finger cannot touch its own tip. Can the blade of a sword cut itself? 'vedya', 'vedaka' and 'vedanā', that is, the knowable, the knower the knowing cannot be one, because the invisible cannot have the nature of three.

आत्मभावं यथा दीपः संप्रकाशयतीति चेत्।।
नैव प्रकाश्यते दीपो यस्मान्न तमसावृतः।।१८।।

(The Vijnānavādis say) —

18. Just as the lamp illuminates itself (as well as other things, so does the mind see itself).
(the Mādhyamikas reply) —
The lamp does not illuminate itself because it is not covered with darkness.

The Vijnānvādis' postulation that the mind can see itself just as a lamp illuminates itself cuts no ice with the Mādhyamikas who regard the similitude fallacious. A lamp is needed only to remove an 'āvarana' or cover of darkness. Thus the existence of objects (of darkness) for illuminating them is a primary pre-requisite for the lamp's functioning as an illuminating agent. The 'sādhya' or the object or goal is essential for 'siddhi' or the practising of its achievement. The lamp is secondary, the objects required to be illuminated are primary. And, that which does not exist cannot be illuminated. The lamp being illumination itself, does not need any other illumination; need not illuminate itself. It need only illuminate something else,-darkness.

न हिस्फटिकवन्नीलं नीलत्वेऽन्यमपेक्षते।
तदा किन्चित्परापेक्षमनपेक्षं च दृश्यते।।१९।।

The Vinjānvādis say —

19. Just as that which is blue like 'sphatika' or quartz is in no need of blueness from any other source, so also things (like vessels etc) depend on another thing (like the lamp etc) to light them.

In this śloka, the vijñanavādis try to establish the difference between two types of blueness: that which is natural to an object like the lapis lazuli and that which is obtained from another source like that from a blue-coloured paper. It is like the light which is natural to a lamp as arising from its own source and the light which fills other objects, vessels etc. when it is emanating from the lamp. This distinction between the two types must be kept in mind, they argue.

अनीलत्वे न तन्नीलं नीलहेतुर्यथेक्षयते।
नीलमेव हि को नीलंकुर्यादात्मानमात्मना।।२०।।

20. The blueness (of quartz) is not blue without a dependent cause of blueness. There is to be seen a cause of blueness. How can blue make itself blue all by itself?

The Mādhyamikas retort that the aforesaid example of the quartz or lapis lazuli is again faulty as it cannot stand the test of logic. What is erroneously called natural blue is really not so, because there must be some other originating factor responsible for the so called naturalness of its blue. There is bound to be some 'neel.hetu' or the cause of blueness. Certainly did it not make itself blue by itself because it cannot be its own cause. Nothing is its own cause; all is of dependent origination. So, how can blue be blue without any other dependent cause? In fact, the blue of the crystal or quartz is a stabilised form of matter after a long but certain causal process it has undergone. Its present blueness is a dependent phenomena, being 'hetupratyayādheena'?

दीपः प्रकाशत इति ज्ञात्वा ज्ञानेन कथ्यते।
बुद्धिः प्रकाशत इति ज्ञात्वा केनचिदुच्यते।।२२।।

21. Missing in Skt. text
22. (If the Vijnānavādis say that) the lamp illuminates itself and this is so said after jnāna or conscious cognition, (the Madhyamikas 'counter-postulate is)' How and by whom can it be said that the 'buddhi' or intellect illuminates itself?

The declaration that the lamp illuminates is made only

after a conscious cognition of the lamp as an illuminating object. But, what cognitive agent will testify when the intellect is illuminated. Upon being perceived by what faculty and how can it be said that the mind illuminates itself? Ultimately speaking, neither self-cognition nor other cognitions are established as truly existing. Therefore, the vijnānavādis' argument about self-cognition is wrong. It is the 'vishaya' or object which establishes 'vijnāna' or cognition and not 'vijnana' or cognition which establishes the object. The two being interdependent, they are non-existent in essence; they are 'svabhāvaśunya!

प्रकाशा वाप्रकाशा वा यदा दृष्टा न केनचित्।
वन्ध्यादुहितृलीलेव कथ्यमानापि सा मुधा।।२३।।

23. Since neither the illuminated nor the un-illuminated are not perceived by anybody (as truly existent) it is as fruitless to speak (of a self-illuminating mind) as to discuss the pranks of the daughter of a barren woman.

The illuminated refers to the so called self-cognitive mind which is like the lamp. The unilluminated refers to other objects like vessels, jugs and jars, which depend on the lamp to illuminate them. These are not seen as truly existent by anybody. There is no question of the 'svasamvedana' or self-cognition of the mind. To imagine it so is to indulge in the fruitless pastime of discussing the looks and features of the daughter of a barren woman.

यदि नास्ति स्वसंवित्तिर्विज्ञानं स्मर्यते कथम्।
अन्यानुभूते संबन्धात् स्मृतिराखुविषं यथा।।२४।।

The Vijnānavādis question:

24. If self-cognition (of intellect) or 'vijnāna' does not exist, how is the act of cognition of intellect or mind remembered?

The Mādhyamikas reply:

It is remembered from its relationship to the experiencing of other things as in the case of rat-poison.

The Vijñanavādis believe that in the absence of 'sva-samvedanama' or self-cognition, the memory of such cognition cannot be there. In fact, there can be no remembrance of that which has not been experienced. Hence, because of the memory of the fruit of experience or 'anubhava-phala' later, it has to be presumed that there is self-cognition in the context of the 'jnāna' which the 'buddhi' gets. In the deductive process of recollection of objects or experiences through memory or 'smarana 'śakti' the factor of self-cognition is an inevitable premise. If memory is definite after self-cognition, memory also becomes the cause of self-cognition as an inherent cause like smoke in fire.

To all the above reasoning, the Mādhyamikas' answer is that self-cognition or conscious experience is not essential for memory or recollection of an experience of other things or objects. For example, take the instance of 'ākhu-visha' or rodent poison. One may not be aware of the posion of a rat-bite instantly when bitten by it. However, when clouds come thundering over the sky during the rainy weather, the pain wakes up with all its side effects and the memory of the bite is then ressurected, whereas this revival of the memory is not based on the immediate self-cognition of its poison by the bitten person. It must be noted that, in this case, the experience of a subsequent event gets linked with an earlier, unconscious happening. As the essence of all this process is not

the object but its experience, therefore it is that its recollection gets inter-linked with the memory of an earlier object or event.

प्रत्ययान्तरयुक्तस्य दर्शनात्स्वं प्रकाशते।
सिद्धाञ्जनविधेर्दृष्टो घटो नैवाञ्जनं भवेत्।।२५।।

The Vijnānvadis argue —

25. One can have self-cognition through cognition of or through seeing other objects from their causal conditions or 'pratyayas'.

The Mādhyamikas reply —

The vessel, seen through the method or medium of a siddha's (consecrated) collyrium, does not itself become collyrium.

The Vijñanavadis say that, given certain causal conditions, a person can peep into the minds of other persons. For example, an 'eeksanika' or fortune-teller can easily look into the mind of another being because his training has provided him with the necessary causal conditions to do so. It, therefore, follows that, with causal conditions or 'pratyayas' existing, he can see his own 'chitta' also. His own chitta' is so near him while that of others is a little far removed from cognition. When he, through his 'eekśanika vidyā' can experience the latter, why can't he the former?

The Mādhyamika replies, "Well if a person can see a vessel through the medium or application to eyes of collyrium which has been consecrated by the incantational charms of a siddha, the vessel cannot become collyrium; that is, the collyrium cannot be seen by him as he does

the 'ghata' or the vessel although the former is so close to his eyes. Therefore, it has to be concluded that the knowledge gained through a sooth-sayer's art, like the vessel seen, does not convey its cognition or 'samvedanā'. It is an exercise in futility alone. When that which now appears apparent has no basis in reality, its cognition cannot lead to any worth-while conclusions".

The Vijnanāvādis argue that, in the absence of self-cognition, it would be impossible to establish other cognitions. If self-cognition does not exist, how can other cognitions? What about cognitions from the senses of eye and ear etc? How would even illusory cognition occur in the absence of which there can be no ultimate cognition of 'paramārtha'?

The next 'śloka provides an answer to these questions.

यथा दृष्टं श्रुतं ज्ञातं नैवेह प्रतिषिध्यते।
सत्यतः कल्पनात्वत्र दुःखहेतुनिवार्यते।।२६।।

Says the Mādhyamika:

26. Whatever cognition comes from seeing, hearing or knowing is not denied but these are negated only because to conceive them as real is the cause of 'dukha'.

The intention here is not to negate as such whatever cognition accrues from seeing phenomena with the eyes, or from things which are palpably present before the eyes, or that which is heard through 'āgama' or scriptures or scriptural discourses, or that which is known and established through the three-fold cognitive media of 'rupa' (form) 'linga' (gender) and 'anumāna' (conjecture). What is negated is the concept of such cognitions as something true or real, for such they are not; they are

illusory. They are negated because a belief in them to be truly existing would only lead to 'dhuka' as said in Abhidharma-'kośa:

दुःखं समुदयो लोको दृष्टिस्थानं भवश्च ते।

चित्तादन्या न माया चेन्नाप्यनन्येति कल्प्यते।
वस्तु चेत् सा कथं नान्याऽनन्या चेन्नास्ति वस्तुतः।।२७।।

27. There is no 'māyā' are illusion separate from the mind. Even if it is imagined as separate, how can it be a (separate) thing apart from the mind? If the mind itself is 'māyā? the thing (separate from it) cannot exist in ultimate fact.

The Vijnanvadis say that there is no illusion apart from the mind although illusory objects cannot be called mind itself either; that is, they are neither separate from the mind nor a part of it. Now, such a situation gives rise to four possibilities: the illusion-like objects are separate from the mind, they are not separate from mind, they are both separate and un-separate being 'ubhaya-svabhāva' or of dual nature, they are un-like this dual nature being 'anubhaya-svabhāva'. The first possibilty is negated by the belief that the external world is nothing but the mind's reflection: 'chittamātram jagadichhta'. The second possibility is negated by the belief that no illusion can touch the mind and, therefore, nothing separate from it exists: 'praspara-virudhyorekatra abhāvāta'. The fourth possibility is negated by the first hypothesis, that is, there are no illusion-like things separate from the mind and the non-duality of differing natures cannot exist. Thus the vijnānvadis hold that illusion-like phenomena, though not apart from the mind, are not of the mind either.

The Mādhyamikas argue that the logic of the Vijnān-vādis cannot hold water. If 'māyā' or illusion is a thing or an object how can it be neither the thing nor the mind? It has to be either of the two. To say that it is neither of the two is tantamount to denying its existence at any plane. If the mind itself is considered as the illusory thing, the thing separate from the mind is naught; it exists not in fact ('parmārthata') or reality.

असत्यपि यथा माया दृश्या द्रष्टृ तथा मनः ।
वस्त्वाश्रयश्चेत् संसारः सोऽन्यथाकाशवद् भवेत ।।२८ ।।

28. Just as 'māyā', although not really existing, can be seen, so also the mind (though unseen) can be the beholder (of true phenomena). If the 'samsāra' is not dependent on things or phenomena, it would be something like empty space.

The Madhyamika view is that just as 'māyā, although illusory, can be seen, so also the mind, although unseen, can be the seer of the reality of objects or things. It can discriminate between illusion and reality and behold 'parmārtha satya'.

The Vijnānvādis say that every illusory object or phenomena has to have a true base otherwise everything would be like empty void and there would be no basis for the concept of 'mokśa' and 'samsāra'. They argue that the two factors of 'samkleśa' and 'vyavadāna' which picturise the external phenomena or the śamsāra', both belong to the mind. The mind, alone and by itself, perceives the higher truth and it does not need any super-imposition of external things or illuson to see reality. If external things of çyclic world are to be its props, these being different, the mind would perceive only differing facts and

not reality. Hence, there is nothing to be termed as 'sam-sāra' for the mind like the horns of a donkey. The mind and its objects or wordly things may appear as two separate entities to odinary beings in cyclic existence but in actual fact, they are identical. They are both of the nature of the mind, the one being the subjective knower and the other an appearing aspect of the mind that is known. Hence, real consciousness is the only truly existing consciousness which is also non-dual and that consciousness is the mind.

वस्त्वाश्रयेणाभावस्य क्रियावत्त्वं कथं भवेत्।
असत्सहायमेकं हि चित्तमापद्यते तव।।२९।।

29. In the absence of an object as a support, how would it (i.e. the mind) become the seer or beholder? O, your concept is that of the mind as a mere unaided, lone entity.

The Mādhyamika argues that there is an inseparable link between 'kārya' and 'kārana'. How can, therefore, the mind become the doer or the seer of reality in the absence of a prop. There can be no support or 'aśraya' of a non-existing thing nor can non-existence be the cause of any act. In the absence of the mind having no basis or support of 'māyā', what can it do being even non-dual? It cannot function as a solitary, non-dual consciousness unassisted by any object or thing. Therefore, the concept of the vijnanavādi chitta-mātrins of the mind as an unaided, lone functionary is unrealistic, to say the least.

ग्राह्यमुक्तं यदा चित्तं तदा सर्वे तथागताः।
एवं हि को गुणो लब्धश्चित्तमात्रेऽपि कल्पिते।।३०।।

30. If the mind could be accepted as free from

dependence (on objects) all sentient beings would become Tathagatas. There is no merit in the Mind – only concept.

The Mādhyamika continues to argue further in this śloka. If, as pleaded by the Mind-only school, the mind is accepted as not dependent on or existing separately from its illusory objects, there would be no need for beings to overcome disturbing conceptions etc. All beings would become self-cognitive Buddhas and there would be left no 'prathag-janāh' or common, ordinary beings and the path shown by Lord Buddha for eradicating kleśas would become a meaningless exhortation. Where does the vijnānvadis' argument stand in view of this? Does it not look meaningless? Therefore, no merit can accrue from believing in the 'chittamatra' concept of the mind, which is contrary to the teaching of Sakyamuni Buddha.

मायोपमत्वेऽपि ज्ञाते कथं क्लेशो निवर्तते।
यदा मायास्त्रियां रागस्तत्कर्तुरपि जायते।।३१।।

31. Even if the world is to be regarded as of the nature of 'māyā' how are the 'kleśas' averted! For instance, even its creator falls in love with the 'māyā-woman.

अप्रहीणा हि तत्कर्तुर्ज्ञेयसंक्लेशवासना।
तद्दृष्टिकाले तस्यातो दुर्बला शून्यवासना।।३२।।

32. The creator of that (illusory woman) is unable to abandon the tendency (towards disturbing conceptions), because he is ignorant of the 'jñeya-āvarana' or outer cover of kleśa. On seeing her (i.e. 'māyā- stri) his concept of emptiness grows very weak.

The first śloka poses a question on behalf of the Vastuvādins and the second provides the answer. A doubt arises as to how the knowledge of the illusory nature of things can help in the conquest of kleśas. Even if one knows that .the world is of the nature of māyā or illusion and that all phenomena of cyclic existence are illusory, how could the disturbing ill-conceptions be averted? How could they be warded off? For example, even the magician who creates an illusory woman through his art can easily develop attachment for her. Not to speak of the onlookers for whose delight the illusion has been created by him but even the magician himself gets infatuated with lust at the sight of his own creation even when he is fully aware of her nature as purely 'māyā'. Thus it is very difficult to cut off attachment to an illusion. How can, then, kleśas generated by such attachment, be averted?

The creator (i.e. the magician) of that illusion (i.e. the illusory woman) is unable to abandon the tendency towards the disturbing conception of lust towards even a known and knowable entity like that illusory woman. He knows well that the creature is his own creation through magic and that it has a super-imposed vesture of palpable reality devoid of all real entity. Still he is not prepared to accept his known side of the illusion. Hence at the very sight of the illusory woman, his concept of emptiness or 'śunyatā' of all phenomena is totally eroded; it becomes very weak. Even such an empty illusion of emptiness eludes his grasp as he is overcome by 'bhāvavasanā' and 'samkleśa-vāsanā'. He is ignorant both of the illusion of 'jneya'-cover and the illusory woman. His knowledge of the śunya-nature of the illusory woman is too weak to distract his mind away from the illusory woman. As such, his concept of 'śunyata' is too brittle to embrace the totality of 'śunya-dharmatā of all phenomena.

शून्यताभावनाधानाद्धीयते भाववासना।
किंचिन्नास्तीति चाभ्यासात्सापि पश्चात्प्रहीयते।।३३।।

33. By taking to the tendency towards emptiness the predilecton for accepting phenomena as truly existing will be diminished. Later, with constant practice of the tendency that 'nothing is' even the tendency towards emptiness will be abolished.

One must develop the tendency towards accepting the 'nissvabhāvarā' of all dharmas or the non-existence of all phenomena. Through constant and gradual practice the 'bhāva-vāsanā' or the lust for accepting phenomena as truly existing will be eroded. This is so because the two tendencies are mutually opposed like the feeling of cold disappearing in the proximity of fire:

शून्यता सर्वदृष्टीनां प्रोक्ता निस्सरणं बुधैः।
येषां तु शून्यतादृष्टिस्तान साध्यान बभाषिरे।।

If, one goes on continually practising it with the formula 'nothing is' as the matrix, a stage will be achieved where even the tendency towards 'śunyatā' will be abolished; that is, all apprehension of false phenomena as well as emptiness itself will finally disappear in a state where no disturbing conceptions of one or the other kind can stay. This is called the emptiness of emptiness, because 'sarva-sankalpa-hānāye śūnyatā-amritdeśanā'. Such 'sunvatā' is called 'parmārtha-śunyatā'.

यदा न लभ्यते भावो यो नास्तीति प्रकल्प्यते।
तदा निराश्रयो भावः कथं तिष्ठेन्मतेः पुरः।।३४।।

34. If the thing that is to be negated is not there

(due to its non-existing nature), it (in fact) becomes baseless. How can, then, this non-existing thing sustain itself in the mind?

When the concept of the non-existence of a thing is constantly deliberated upon, it ceases to exist at all. It is not there because of its non-existing nature too as the inherent nature of all things is 'missbhavatā' like the tuft of hair illusively seen by a 'taimarika' or a person suffering from night-blindness. Since the very basis, that is the idea of true existence, is removed, how can the unreal and imagined concept stay in the mind in the absence of the so-called binding base? Just as the son of a barren woman does not exist, where can be the question of his death? The very basis is non-existent in itself. Herein the concept of 'sarva-dharma-śunyatā' is emphasised as a practice so as to eradicate thought-jumbling of the mind. And, śunyatā too is removed when the concept of emptiness is constantly meditated upon. Therefore, in order to do away with all the shackling concepts of thought or 'kalpnā-jāla', Lord Buddha preached the practice of eighteen types of 'śunyatā' like 'adhyātma śunyatā' etc. It has been said in the Prajnā-Pārmitā-sutra;

"Again, O Subhuti! bodhisattva, the great being, practising prajnā-pārmitā, has this attitude while his mind is attuned to 'sarvajnatā' or perfect knowledge of all phenomena,-' form is not emptiness owing to the emptiness of form: form itself is emptiness and emptiness is form. Feeling is not emptiness owing to the emptiness of feeling; feeling itself is emptiness and emptiness is feeling. Cognition is not emptiness owing to the emptiness of cognition; cognition itself is emptiness and emptiness is cognition. The 'samskaras' are not emptiness owing to the emptiness of samskaras, samskaras themselves are emptiness and emptiness are samsakaras.'"

यदा न भावो नाभावो मतेः संतिष्ठते पुरः ।
तदान्यगत्यभावेन निरालम्बा प्रशाम्यति ।।३५।।

35. When there is neither 'is-ness' nor 'non-is-ness' existing before the mind, there being no other course, the mind, without a support, will become tranquil.

A thing or concept either exists or does not exist. When there is neither a thing nor a nothing the mind will have no concept to deliberate upon. Hence, when there is neither is-ness nor non-isness before the mind, there being no alternative, the mind will attain a state of perfect equanimity as it will be deprived of its props of is-ness and non-isness. Like fire bereft of all fuel, the mind will get stilled in absolute tranquillity. All concepts, all alternatives will evaporate and a state of complete 'nivritti' or detachment will result. The alternatives that act as disturbing concepts, for example, are to believe that something is both a thing and a nothing and that it is neither a thing nor a nothing. To rise above such concepts is to attain absolute 'praśānti', absolute peace.

चिन्तामणिः कल्पतरूर्यथेच्छापरिपूरणः ।
विनेयप्रणिधानाभ्यां जिनबिम्बं तथेक्ष्यते ।।३६।।

36. Just as the 'chintāmani' and the 'kalpataru' fulfill all desires so is the physical body of the 'jina' for those who are devoted (with their mind) to him (i.e. Buddha).

'Chintāmani' is the mythological wish-fulfilling gem and 'kalpataru' the all-boon-giving tree. Just as these two confer the desired boons and whatever one may desire for or aspire after, so is the 'bimba' or the figure of the

conqueror Buddha. The latter also fulfils all the wishes of the devotees as a reward for their meritorious actions. The 'chintāmani' and the 'kalpataru' have no conceptual motivations by themselves but still they confer boons for the good of others due to the good karma of the beings and the conqueror's own prowers. They are like the wheel of the potter which revolves from no self-motivation and for no selfish motive but only for conferring beautiful shapes on formless clay. Lord Buddha, having conquered Mara or Evil, is all-powerful. As such, the physical body of the jina bears thirty two distinctive marks of greatness. He is untouched by any motivations and has no wishes of his own, being a 'samahita-chitta' i.e. being ever in a state of perfect traquillity. The night the Tathagata became the Enlightened One he uttered not a word but, those who were his humble devotees and eager to listen to him, could hear words emanating from his 'urni-kosa'. This is still valid for all devotees of his form:

नोदाहृतं त्वया किंचिदेकमप्यक्षरं विभो।
कृतस्नश्च वैनेयजनो धर्मवर्षेण तपितः।

The word 'bimba' means an image, a shadow, a sphere, an orb or a reflected form.

Lord Buddha is the 'jina or the conqueror as 'chatur-marajaya' or the vanquisher of four types of Maras, as also being the conqueror of all evil dharmas.

यथा गारुडिकः स्तभं साधयित्वा विनश्यति।
स तस्मिंश्चिरनष्टेऽपि विषादीनुपशाम्यति।।३७।।

37. Just as when a 'gāruḍika' builds and consec-

rates a (wooden) pillar and then dies, it is capable of countering (the effects of) poison etc. for a long time even after his death.

'Gārudika' is a person who knows the mysteries of poison and such other harmful things including evil planetary influences. With extraordinary powers acquired through mantra 'śakti' he builds and consecrates with incantational charms a wooden column which is capable of warding off the harmful effects of poison and other evil things. Even after the physical death of its builder the mantra-sanctified pillar continues to perform its salutary and beneficial function of warding off poison and calamities born of planetary influences. So is the body of the conqueror, Lord Buddha. Like the 'gāruḍika's' pillar it contnues to exercise its efficacious, healing powers even after physical disappearance. Lord Buddha continues to neutralise and serve as an antidote for all the evils of cyclic existence for the sake of devotees. His spritiual guidance is perennially available to the world. Even when a bodhisattva attains Buddhahood his compassionate ministry for the well-being of 'sattvas' continues apace.

बोधिचर्यानुरूप्येण जिनस्तंभोऽपि साधितः।
करोति सर्वकार्याणि बोधिसत्वेऽपि निर्वृते।।३८।।

38. The pillar-like jina also, likewise consecrated through 'bodhicharya', performs all (beneficial) acts even when the bodhisattva has passed into a state of 'nirvana'.

What is 'bodhicharyā'? It is the practices followed for the attainment of complete Buddhahood or enlightenment: 'buddhatvārtham, charyā yā sā bodhicharyā'. The jina or the conqueror (the bodhisattva) is here compared

to the mantra-consecrated column which is capable of efficacious dispensations even after the physical passing away of its author or builder. The conqueror bodhisattva is a perfected and consecrated being for entering the path of enlightenment through the practice of 'bodhi-charyā'. Like the consecrated column, the bodhisattva, too continues to perform all kinds of beneficial acts for sattvas' even when he has physically disappeared and passed into a state of final emancipation or 'nirvāna' beyond the state of any conceptual desire or wish or, to put it differently, when he has attained the 'dharmakāyā' as void as space.

It has been said in Vajra-chhedika:

धर्मतो बुद्धा द्रष्टव्या धर्मकाया हि नायकाः।
धर्मता चाप्यविज्ञेया न सा शक्या विजानितुम।।

that is, it is the 'dharmakāyā' of the Buddhas that is to be noticed, it is the 'dharmakāyās' that guide. One cannot know them if one is ignorant of the 'dharmakāyā.'

Therefore, it is not the physical presence but the everlasting eternal dharma-essence of the presence of the conquerors that guides 'sattvas'.

अचित्तके कृता पूजा कथं फलवती भवेत्।
तुल्यैव पठ्यते यस्मात् तिष्ठतो निर्वृतस्य च।।३९।।

39. How can worship offered to the Tathagata void of mind (or any conceptual effects), be fruitful? (The 'āgama' says that) in both cases (in body and bodyless state) equal merit accrues.

The first line of this śloka is a question in the form of a

doubt expressed by a 'śrāvaka'. The second line is the answer to the query. The question: how do you speak of great merits accruing from the worship of the Tathagata when you declare him to be 'nivritta-sārvāchitta-chaitya-vyāpāra', that is, devoid of any mind or conceptual functions of the mind? The answer of the Mādhyamika is that it has been propounded in the 'āgama' that, in both cases, equal merit or 'punya' accrues. The Maitreya-mahā-simha-nāda-sutra also states: "while worshipping Buddha when he is in body or worshipping his relics when he has passed beyond sorrow, the worshipper earns the same merit."

आगमाच्च फलं तत्र संवृत्या तत्त्वतोऽपि वा।
सत्यबुद्धे कृता पूजा सफलेति कथं यथा।।४०।।

40. According to 'āgama' (or the word of the Lord), merit accrues from that (i.e. the worship of Buddha) whether performed from the 'samvrita' or the 'paramārthic' view. Just as the worship offered to the 'satya-Buddha' brings true results (so also is it otherwise).

The scriptures that constitute the word of the Buddha say that merit would certainly accrue whether Buddha is worshipped as apparently existing or as truly existing. The difference is merely that of outlook. Just as the Vastuvādins claim to attain ultimate 'punya' through the worship of 'paramārtha' Buddha, so does merit accrue to them who adore Buddha as a 'vyavahār-satya'. The scriptures say: "Those who worship the Tathagata, in his 'simha-vikrīdita mudrā' or the sauntering-lion-pose, either in existent or non-existent form, tread the same path and attain equal merit. He who looks at the Tathagata-the conqueror of evil, the truly enlightened one, in

the lion pose-and derives blissful joy from such a concept and worships him as the master with all the regalia of worship like 'cheevara', 'pindapāta', 'shayana' 'āsana' etc., and he who worships the 'pari-nivritta' Tathagata's little mental image, as small as a sesame grain,-both, attain equal merit". This assurance is from 'Pushpakūta dhārani. It is further said, "He who worships the Tathagata in the lion-pose for a hundred years or a thousand years with all the requisites of joyful prayer or he who offers only a solitary flower on the 'chaitya' of a 'parinivritta' Būddha with his mind fully established in 'bodhi', both are equal. The worship of Tathagata in the saunteringlion-pose with all joyous offerings,-offering the Lord palmfuls of water, sprintkling with holy water, offering the gift of a holy baton or 'eeśikā', removing faded garlands (from the image), offering holy ointments and lamps and uttering with a joyous mind the words 'obeisance to the Lord Buddha', — is saved from falling into lower realms for long ages.

सत्यदर्शनतो मुक्तिः शून्यतादर्शनेन किम्।
न विनानेन मार्गेण बोधिरित्यागमो यतः।।४१।।

41. When 'mukti' can come through the realisation of truth, what is the use of realising 'sunyatā'? Well, the scriptures say that there is no attainment of bodhi except through the path of 'śunyatā,

In this śloka, the Vaibhaśikas pose an interesting question to which the Mādhyamikas furnish an answer. It is said that the realisation of the truth of the Four Noble Truths leads to emancipation. This being so, what further need is there to contemplate on and realise emptiness? Herein the word 'satya darśana' means the realisa-

tion of the four 'ārya satyas' or the noble truths of 'dukha', 'samudaya', 'nirodha' and 'mārga', Isn't a realisation of this four-fold truth enough to confer enlightenment and emancipation? Why, then, all the ballyhoo about emptiness and all that? The answer is what the scripture declares : 'there is no acquiring of bodhi except through the contemplation of 'śunyatā'. This is the postulate of Prajnā-pārmita sutras. It is 'prajnā' that teaches people to discriminate between the outer crust and the kernel, between the 'āropita' or super-imposed truth and the 'anā-ropita or the real truth. Otherwise, would not even children become Tathagatas? And, the best way to remove the veil of superimposed reality is to contemplate on the emptiness of all phenomena or 'sarva-dharma śunyatā.' In the Prajñapārmita-sutra, the Lord says to Subhuti: "the great being, the bodhisattva, while practising the prajña-pārmitās, does not register feelings of form, pain, consciousness, activity, etc." In fact, there is absence of all 'bhāva'. For, there can be no feeling of emptiness for him who maintains 'bhāva' or feeling. The lord has further said in the Prajñapārmitā-sutra: "O Subhuti, the great being bodhisattva, while practising prajna-parmita does not have the bhāva of form, of vedanā, samjña, samskāras, nor even of the path he treads nor of the perfection of knowing." Why? Because, for those who possess bhāva, there is no feeling of prajñapārmitās, there is no feeling of dāna-pārmitā, there is no feeling of the emptiness of 'abhāva' -etc. Any possession of such 'bhava' only activates 'aham' or ego which, in turn, overcasts true realisation of the nature of phenomena and leads astray. Whence could be emancipation, then?

नन्वसिद्धं महायानं कथं सिद्धस्त्वदागमः ।
यस्मादुभयसिद्धोऽसौ न सिद्धोऽसौ तवादितः । ।४२ । ।

42-43. (The Vastuvādin says)—The Mahāyāna's is

not an accredited (āgama). (The Mādhayamika replies): Well, then, how is your āgama? (The Vastudvādin says) — Because, we both believe the (Hīnayana) agama to be accredited. (The Mādhyamika replies):

यत्प्रत्यया च तत्रास्था महायानेऽपि तां कुरु ।
अन्योभयेष्टसत्यत्वे वेदादेरपि सत्यता । ।४३ । ।

This (i.e. the Hīnayāna āgama) was not accredited for you from the very beginning. The very factors that have made you believe in that should also lead you to believe in Mahāyāna scriptures. Moreover, two persons mutually believing a postulate to be true (as you argüe) would also lead to believing the Vedas, etc. as accredited truth.

The Vastuvādin says, "O advocate of emptiness, I do not believe the Mahāyāna scriptures to be duly accredited. Their teachings are not the word of Buddha. So I cannot give up Hīnayāna and enter on your path". The Mādhyamika's rejoinder is a counter question: "If Mahāyāna scriptures are not Buddha's word, how do you prove that your scriptures are His? What proof is there for their accredition? what 'pramāṇa?" His reply is that Hīnayāna being the earlier vehicle, its scriptures and teachings are basic to both as the acknowledged word of the Lord. That in itself is an argument for their authenticity. The Mādhyamika takes up cudgels and rebuts that the Hīnayāna scriptures were not established as the Lord's word before these were throughly perused and deliberated upon. It was only then that the Hīnayānīs came to have faith in them as the accredited word of

Buddha. Now, what is the word of Buddha? It is that which has been handed down as such through the guru-śishya tradition from generation to generation and forms the sutra; it is found in the vinaya; it fortifies 'dharmatā'. That and that alone is Buddha's word. The test of preceptor disciple lineage can equally apply to Mahāyāna scriptures. So, if the Hinayanis believe in the one, they cannot deny the other for obvious reasons. Also, if in mutual controversy two persons agree to a certain thing being true, it does not make it a really acceptable truth in all cases, for then even the non-Buddhist scriptures like the Vedas would have to be considered as accepted truth. Hence the fact of two contending debators striking a mutual compromise over truth would not make that truth really plausible.

सविवादं महायानमिति चेदागमं त्यज।
तीर्थिकैः सविवादत्वात्स्वैः परैश्चागमान्तरम्। ।४४।।

44. If (the credit-worthiness of) Mahāyāna is disputable, you (the Hīnayāni) should also abjure your scriptures as they too are disputed by Tīrthakas and others owing to the difference of interpretation.

The Vastudvadin disputes the authenticity and authority of Mahāyāna scriptures and stipulates that what is disputable cannot, in the final analysis, be relied upon. According to the Mādhayamikas the same argument could be applicable to the Hīnayāna scriptures as these too are disputed by many Buddhist and non-Buddhist schools. There are various controversies owing to differences of interpretation of the scriptures among the mimānsikas and others. How can these scriptures, therefore, be relied upon?

शासनं भिक्षुतामूलं भिक्षुतैव च दुःस्थिता।
सावलम्बनचित्तानां निर्वाणमपि दुःस्थितम्। ।४५।।

45. Śāsana is the root of monkhood. However, monkhood is ill-stationed (if rooted in 'āryasatyas' alone). Even nirvana is ill-stationed for those who rely on props.

What is 'śāsana'? It is those words of Lord Buddha which instruct: 'do this, do not do this', It is defined as भगवता हिताहित स्वीकार परिहार देशना। This instruction as contained in the Tripitaka is the root of the monk calling or monk-hood, Why? Because, if a tree is firmly rooted it lasts long and is capable of performing its functions like providing leaves, flowers, fruit, shade, coolness, etc. with its branches and foliage. So also is Lord Buddha's wish-fulfilling tree of 'śāsana' or the 'sankalpa-pādapa' firmly rooted in monkhood roots, providing with its branches and foliage of the eight-fold path and the bodhi-mārga cool shade and fruits of protecting people from the heat of 'kleśas', etc. There are five types of monks: sanjña-bhikshu, pratiĵna bhikshu, bhikshana-śīla bhikshu, jñaypti-chaturtha-karma-up-sampanna bhikshu and bhinna-kleśa bhikshu. of these, the last two are the most superior, the fifth being even superior to the fourth. Thus 'bhikshutā' or monkhood is the standard bearer of 'śāsana'. However, if monkhood remains bogged down in the contemplation of 'ārya-satyas' alone as divorced from 'śunyatā', there is no prossibility of release or emancipation from samsāra. Monks who rely on such props as the truth of suffering or 'dukhadi-satyam' and 'kleśa-visamyoga' are not true of mind or 'nirālambanchitta'; they are of dependent mind or 'savālāmban-chitta.' Real monkhood is difficult to practise with such supports. True 'bhikshutā' or monkhood entails the contemplation of emptiness where all props are discarded. Such contemplation alone leads to emancipation.

क्लेशप्रहाणान्मुक्तिश्चेत तदनन्तरमस्तु सा।
दृष्टं च तेषु सामर्थ्यं निष्क्लेशस्यापि कर्मणः। ।४६।।

46. If the destruction of kleśas leads to 'mukti,' why should it (i.e. the tendency to act and gere-nate kleśa) persist even long afterwards? It has been observed that, even in that non-kleśa state, the power to indulge in karma stays.

The Vastuvādins say that all kleaśas are annihilated by a realisation of the four noble truths. One becomes an 'arhata' and emancipation is attained. However, the Mādhyamikas state that, even after such a state of arhat-ship, the tendency to perform karma which, con-squently, gives birth to further klesas,- persists for long. This is a negation of 'mukti'. This fact has been observed in many cases. Even in the non-kleśa state, the tendency towards and capacity for action stays on. Whence is emancipation for such? Prajñakarmati cities the cases of Arya Maudgalyāna and Arya Angulimāla who had attai-ned the 'arhata' power of granting wishes, etc. but their 'sāmarthya' or capacity for karma was the result of good and bad actions during their earlier and ignoble or 'anārya' states of conduct. Craving for action alone is enough to push one into rebirth. He who can shed crav-ing sheds the root cause of re-birth. The two arhats' power to grant wishes was also a kind of craving and, therefore, enough to cause a redescent into samsāra.

तृष्णा तावदुपादानं नास्ति चेत्संप्रधार्यते।
किमक्लिष्टापि तृष्णैषां नास्ति संमोहवत् सती। ।४७।।

47. The Vastuvādin—
If it is agreed that craving is not the cause of (their) rebirth, why then can't there be a

kleśa-shorn craving for those (arhatas)?
The madhyamika —
Because of ignorance (about the kleśa-less aspect of craving)

The Vastuvādin says that in such arhats as defined in the Abhidharma no kleśas are generated as they have no craving or 'triśnā'. Hence there can be no question of re-birth for them. The Mādhyamika replies that this is not so. May be, those arhats are devoid of the 'sthūla' or gross kleśas as described in the Abhidharma, but they are not completely free from the sukśma' or finer kleśas such as ignorance or avidyā. Thus they are unaware of the real kleśa-less aspect of craving.

वेदनाप्रत्यया तृष्णा वेदनैषां च विद्यते।
सालम्बनेन चित्तेन स्थातव्यं यत्र तत्र वा।।४८।।

48. 'Vedanā or feeling is the cause of craving and 'vedanā' does persist in these (arhats). A mind which subsists on props remains entangled here and there.

Now, 'sparśa' or touch is the cause of 'vedanā' or feeling and 'vedanā' generates trisnā' or craving. These 'arhatas' the Vastuvādins speak of also continue to harbour 'vedanā' as they continue meditating on the four noble truths as the matrix of their thought. This causes craving. How can there be 'kārya' without 'kāraṅa? Craving is the 'kārya' and 'vedanā' the 'karana' here. For people who continue to revel in 'bhāva' or thought there can be no conquest of ignorance. It is only through a realisation of emptiness that real 'bhikśutā' or monkhood becomes staid, well-established and steady. When the mind continues to seek props, like the four 'ārya-satyas' it continues to waver, woble and wander. It gets entangled

here and there through its attachment to the supports on which its thought process depends. For persons with such an unsteady mind, there can be no release from samsāra.

विना शून्यतया चित्तं बद्धमुत्पद्यते पुनः।
यथासंज्ञिसमापत्तौ भावयेत्तेन शून्यताम्।।४९।।

49. Without emptiness the mind remains bound and is regenerated as in the case of gods when their merit is exhausted. Therefore, 'śunyatā' should be cultivated.

As long as the props of attachment continue, the mind remains bound and imprisoned. 'Āsanga' or attachment is the tether rope that keeps the mind tied. Even after one has been in a state of 'nivritti' or detachment for long through one's meditational powers or 'samādhi-bala,' the mind is born again with all attendant craving. This is so even with gods. After hundreds of kalpas, when their 'vipāka-phala' is exhausted, there is a rebirth of the mind along with mental pocesses. Hence it is that 'śunyatā' must be cultivated. That alone is the hall-mark of true monkhood; that alone leads to emancipation.

यत्सूत्रेऽवतरेद् वाक्यं तच्चेद् बुद्धोक्तमिष्यते।
महायानं भवत्सूत्रैः प्रायस्तुल्यं न किं मतम्।।५०।।

एकेनागम्यमानेन सकलं यदि दोषवत्।
एकेन सूत्रतुल्येन किं न सर्व जिनोदितम्।।५१।।

महाकाश्यपमुख्यैश्च यद् वाक्यं नावगाह्यते।
तत्त्वयानवबुद्धत्वादग्राह्यं कः करिष्यति।।५२।।

50-52. These three 'slokas are found in all Tibetan

versions and their translations but the Darbhanga edition in Sanskrit does not include them. The commentator, Prajnakarmati, considers them as 'prakśipta' or interpolations. Hence he does not include them in his commentary. He also advances reasons, sloka wise, to prove that they are 'prakśipta', the main being that their subject matter is out of context here and that the same has already been touched upon in some of the earlier verses at appropriate places. Hence this set of three ślokas is being excluded for the purposes of the present translation also.

सक्तित्रासात्त्वनिर्मुक्तया संसारे सिध्यति स्थितिः ।
मोहेन दुःखिनामर्थे शून्यताया इदं फलम् ।।५३ ।।

53. The Vastuvadin argues —
The result of (meditating on) 'śunyatā' is this that as a consequence of attachment and fear there is no release and, instead, one stays put in the world of constant flux because of the desire to benefit those in dukha.

Meditating on emptiness constantly has also a flaw for there is always the fear ('trāsa') of attachment ('sakti') and with this apprehension constantly weighing on the mind where could be release ('nir-mukti')? Through infatuation ('moha') for removing the sufferings of beings, one's attachment to them is re-born and one gets enmeshed in samsāra. Consequently, kleśas persist too. So, how can śunyatā be beneficial? That is the question posed by the Vastuvadins.

तदेवं शून्यतापक्षे दूषणं नोपपद्यते ।
तस्मान्निर्विचिकित्सेन भावनीयैव शून्यता ।।५४ ।।

The Māhāyani replies —

54. No, no fault pertains to 'śunyatā' at all. So, shedding all doubts, 'śunyatā' alone should be cultivated.

Even if one stays in the ameliorating 'samsara' out of compassion for beings and for ameliorating their sufferings one can remain untouched by its taints through constantly meditating on emptiness. There will, then, be left no scope for any apprehensions about 'moha' or 'sakti'. 'Śunyatā' alone is the panacea for such fears; hence śunyatā alone should be practised.

क्लेशज्ञेयावृतितमः प्रतिपक्षो हि शून्यता।
शीघ्रं सर्वज्ञताकामो न भावयति तां कथम्।।५५।।

55. 'Śunyatā' alone is the antidote for the darkness of the veil of kleśas and apparent forms. Therefore, why should not one, who desires omniscience or 'buddhatva,' practise it (i.e. emptiness)?

Truth is veiled under the cover of kleśas and the seeming truth of apparent phenomena. This breeds darkness of ignorance. The only way to tear this veil asunder and cross the bounds of darkness is through the practising of 'śunyatā' in all its aspects — 'bhāva śunyatā', 'abhāva śunyatā', 'svabhāva śunyatā' and 'para-bhāva śunyatā, that is, emptíness of the produced, the unproduced, the self-produced and the other-produced.

यद् दुःखजननं वस्तु त्रासस्तस्मात्प्रजायताम्।
शून्यता दुःखशमनी ततः किं जायते भयम्।।५६।।

56. Fear is born of a thing which causes 'dukha', or

suffering. (However), 'śunyatā' is pain-relieving. Why should there be any fear from it?

Nobody wants 'duhka'; everybody wants to be happy. Anything which could be the possible cause of suffering or unhappiness is feared and shunned; therefore, what cause of fear or 'trāsa' could be there from something which is, infact, pain-pacifying and which removes 'dukha; 'Śunyatā' is the one and only such soother. One should cherish it, love it for its beneficial and pain-relieving qualities as it cures one from 'bhava-dukha'.

यतस्ततो वास्तु भयं यद्यहं नाम किंचन।
अहमेव न किंचिच्चेद् भयं कस्य भविष्यति।।५७।।

57. One could really feel afraid of things here and there if there had existed 'ahama' or self but, when there is nothing like 'ahama' or self, whom should one fear?

There is no true 'vastu-sata' or existence of things; there is no existence of this or that self which is called 'ahama' and which feeds the ego. In fact, in the absence of any concept of a self which mainly is the supposed user of objects and the ,viśaya' or objects which are allegedly the 'ahama's feed, 'śunyatā' can be fruitfully meditated upon. When 'pudgal nairātamya' and 'viśaya-dharma-nairātamya' are attained all fear evaporates and 'śunyatā's reign of bliss starts. Constant reflection on emptiness obviates all fear:

नास्म्यहं न भविष्यामि न मेऽस्ति न भविष्यति।
इति बालस्य संत्रासः पण्डितस्य भयक्षयः।।

दन्तकेशनखा नाहं नास्थि नाप्यस्मि शोणितम्।
न सिंघाणं न च श्लेष्मा न पूयं लसिकापि वा।।५८।।

58-60. I am not the teeth, the hair, the nails, nor bones nor blood, nor phlegm nor mucus or pus or lymph.

नाहं वसा न च स्वेदो न मेदोऽन्त्राणि नाप्यहम्।
न चाहमन्त्रनिर्गुण्डी गूथमूत्रमहं न च।।५९।।

I am not flesh or fat or sweat, nor marrow nor viscera, nor hidden intestines or faeces or urine.

नाहं मांसं न च स्नायुर्नोष्मा वायुरहं न च।
न च छिद्राण्यहं नापि षड् विज्ञानानि सर्वथा।।६०।।

I am not flesh or muscles, nor heat nor breath, nor body orifices nor the six perceptions at all.

The above three ślokas are an assertion to prove that the body or its various parts and functional aspects are not the repositories of 'ahama' or 'atmā' or the I self. But, how is it that the desire for happiness or a state of non-suffering is prominent in every sensate being? There must be something which creates such craving though, on investigation, no such agency is found. This, ipso facto, leads to the conclusion that all dharmas are insubstantial and of dependent origination. These are 'nirātma' and 'śunya', without a self. The term 'śata-vijnāna' refers to the experiences of seeing, hearing smelling, tasting and those of the body and the mind.

शब्दज्ञानं यदि तदा शब्दो गृह्येत सर्वदा।
ज्ञेयं विना तु किं वेत्ति येन ज्ञानं निरुच्यते।।६१।।

61. Now, if the self is sound-apprehending, (it being allegedly permanent), sound should also be a permanently acceptable entity. There is no question of jñana' or consciousness in the absence of 'jneya' or object of comprehension (i.e. sound).

Here, Śāntideve proceeds to refute the theories of the Samkhya school of philosophy. The founder of this school of thought was sage Kapila. According to this school, 'prakriti' or nature is the primal substance which causes all phenomena and the self is unchanging. This unchanging consciousness or self, when in false indentification with the phenomena of 'prakriti', becomes bound to the world of phenomena.

Now, if the self is considered as something permanent, the objects it comprehends, like sound, should also be permanent entities even when they are not apparently discernible. 'Jnāna' is that which knows the knowable, it is consciousness of that which is worth being conscious of. If the self is sound-comprehending, its objects of comprehension should also be permanent like itself even when the object is not apparently present. This, certainly, is not the case. Sound being impermanent and occasional, its apprehension is also occasional, Hence there is no permanent 'jnāna' of it.

अजानानां यदि ज्ञानं काष्ठं ज्ञानं प्रसज्यते।
तेनासंनिहित ज्ञेयं ज्ञानं नास्तीति निश्चयः।।६२।।

62. If comprehension or 'jñana' could be there

even in the absence of the object of ẹom-prehension, even a piece of wood would be capable of comprehẹnding sounḍ. Therefore, without the object of 'jñana' being near, there is no 'jñana' or consciousness.

If that which does not know its objects is called 'jnāna' even an inert log of wood could be attributed with the faculty of knowing or comprehension. This being ridiculous, it is clear that the knowledge of comprehension pre-supposes a 'vishaya' or an object of comprehension.

तदेव रूपं जानाति तदा किं न श्रृणोत्यपि।
शब्दस्यासंनिधानाच्चेत्ततस्तज्ज्ञानमप्यसत्।।६३।।

63. The Sāmkhya —
The absence of 'shabda' or sound does not pre-suppose the absence of the comprehender, because a consciousness of (visual) form is aroused by a (previous) consciousness of 'śabda'.

The Mādhyamika says that if there were 'purushsata' or a permanent identify, it would have comprehended sound too at the time of comprehending form. The Sāmkhya replies that; because of a lack of the proximity of sound at that time, it could not have been heard. The Mādhyamika further argues that, consciousness or 'jnāna' which comprehends form need not necessarily comprehend sound or 'śabda' also (being not in close proximity). Thus the argument of the Samakhyas becomes fallacious.

शब्दग्रहणरूपं यत् तद्रूपग्रहणं कथम्।
एकः पिता च पुत्रश्च कल्प्यते न तु तत्त्वतः।।६४।।

64-65. That whose nature it is to comprehend sound, how could that be comprehender of form as well? The same person or form can be both a son and a father only in fancy and not in reality.

सत्त्वं रजस्तमो वापि न पुत्रो न पिता यतः ।
शब्दग्रहणयुक्तस्तु स्वभावस्तस्य नेक्ष्यते ।।६५।।

Just as the qualities of 'sattva' 'rajasa' and 'tamasa' do not (in ultimate analysis) constitute either a son or a father, so also that which is a comprehender of sound is not necessarily a form — comprehender also.

The Mādhyamika poses a very pertinent question; how could that whose nature is to comprehend sound be capable of comprehending form as well? The Sāmkhya answers that there can certainly be two aspects of the same comprehension or consciousness in 'prakriti' just as in life; the same visual form or person can be both a son and a father in mutual relationship to different situations. The Mādhyamika retorts that this could be a matter of fancy and not reality, because these two identities have been foisted on that form by imagination, whereas in the ultimate analysis he is one and the same being or entity. Thus the example cited by the Sāmkhyas does not hold water.

According to the Sāmkhya philosophy, the whole world is made up of the three 'gunas' or qualities of 'sattva' 'rajas' and 'tamasa'.These alone dominate one over the other in the composition of beings; these alone are the predominant factors and not the form or entity, the person. Only these three 'gunas' have a true and independent existence and not the identity of a son or a

father; the nomenclature of the son or the father is fictitious if these three gunas are not taken into consideration. However, according to the Mādhyamika, the whole argument is untenable. It is not necessary that the son inherit the father's gunas. The three gunas are not 'paramārtha tattva' as the Sāmkhyas imagine. The sound-comprehending consciousness would have been visibly present if it had been form-comprehending also, but that is not so.

तदेवान्येन रूपेण नटवत्सोऽप्यशाश्वतः ।
स एवान्यस्वभावश्चेदपूर्वेयं तदेकता ।।६६।।

66-68. Sāmkhya —
It alone appears in another form like a stage actor (in different roles)

Mādhyamika—
Well, if it assumes differet roles, it is a strange kind of permanence you speak of.

अन्यद्रूपमसत्यं चेन्निजं तद्रूपमुच्यताम् ।
ज्ञानता चेत्ततः सर्वंपुंसामैक्यं प्रसज्यते ।।६७।।

Mādhyamika —
If its other forms or roles are untrue or temporary, please explain its real form or role.

Sāmkhya —
(its unity of form consists in) consciousness or 'jnānatā'.

Mādhyamika —
Well, then, that would mean that all beings are one.

चेतनाचेतने चैक्यं तयोर्येनास्तिता समा।
विशेषश्च यदा मिथ्या कः सादृश्याश्रयस्तदा।।६८।।

So also (it would follow from your argument) that the sensate ('purusha') and the insensate ('prakriti') would also become one because they are indentical (being knowable entities). However, when even 'viśesha' or particular consciousnesses are 'mithyā' or unreal how can they have similarity of basis?

According to the samkhyas, the comprehension of sound or 'śabda-jnāna' assumes the comprehension of form in another manner. That is, a previous comprehension of sound is now seen in a comprehension of visual form just as a stage actor assumes different roles. The Mādhyamika replies that the stage actor assumes his different roles temporarily or 'aśaśvtāh', as he foregoes his previous roles naturally. Hence his consciousness is no longer permanent or constant. The Sāmkhya argues that even though this consciousness is in different forms, as in the case of an actor, its nature is permanent and basically unchanged because it is the same actor who performs those many roles. The basic denominator is the 'nata' or the actor and not his differing roles. The Sāmkhya further argues that consciousness appears in other ways and, although the different modes are not true, their basic nature is one and true. But, at this juncture, the Mādhyamika wants to know as to what this nature is that the Sāmkhyas call one and true. The latter's reply is that it is the nature of being conscious, that is, 'jnānatā.' However, as a deduction from this reply, the Mādhyamika retorts: "So it should follow that because of this common denominator of consciousness and this similarity among them, all individuals are one and that one self is present in all." The Mādhyamika continues: "So also would it fol-

low from your argument that the sentient 'purusha' and the insentient 'prakriti' are also one, being identical in merely being existent or knowable indentities. However, when even particular consciousnesses are unreal, how can they have similarity of basis. That is, when particular aspects of a thing are false its general aspects cannot be real."

अचेतनश्च नैवाहमचैतन्यात्पटादिवत्।
अथ ज्ञश्चेतनायोगादज्ञो नष्टः प्रसज्यते।।६९।।

69. The self or 'ahama' cannot be a non-mental or 'achetana' thing (and capable of experiencing objects). Because of its being devoid of 'chetanā' or consciousness it is like (a piece of) cloth, etc. (and so incapable of mental phenomena).

Now Śāntideva goes on to refute the philosophy of the Nyāya school of thought which believes in a non-mental but permanent self, capable of knowing and experiencing objects when in contact with conscious phenomena. The Mādhyamika refutes this by arguing that a non-mental or 'achetana' thing cannot be the self just as clothes, vessels, trees, rocks, etc. cannot be the self or 'ahama' being devoid of the 'chaitanya' or a conscious mental aspect. In fact, the non-conscious self, when coming in touch with conscious objects is bound to change and, therefore, it cannot be a permanent thing as claimed by the Naiyayikas. The argument that the non-conscious self becomes conscious by contact with conscious objects is self-contradictory because it reduces their so-called permanent self to a non-permanent, changing entity, subject to death

अथाविकृत एवात्मा चैतन्येनास्य किं कृतम।
अज्ञस्य निष्क्रयस्यैवमाकाशस्यात्मता मता।।७०।।

70. The Naiyayika —
The self is unchanging.
The Madhyamika —
(If it is unchanging) how does the 'chaitanya' or the conscious transform it? In that case even space (ākāśa') would be called self being functionless and non-conscious.

If the self is unchanging or 'avikrita', how, by being endowed with a mental process, would it become conscious of things, because it by itself is 'achetana' or non-conscious. That would be an improbability. If the self is to be acknowledged as something non-conscious of objects (because they are matter) it would be functionless and incapable of producing effects being unchangeable. Under the circumstances, even space could be termed as a self. Uncreated and non-conscious-like space,—what function could it perform in its unchanging character?.

न कर्मफलसंबन्धो युक्तश्चेदात्मना विना।
कर्म कृत्वा विनष्टे हि फलं कस्य भविष्यति।।७१।।

71-72. Naiyāyika —
There can be no possible link between 'karma' or action and (its) 'phala' or fruit without (the existence of) a self. Who will bear the consequence of the karma performed when karma ceases?

द्वयोरप्यावयोः सिद्धे भिन्नाधारे क्रियाफले।
निर्व्यापारश्च तत्रात्मेत्यत्र वादो वृथा ननु।।७२।।

Mādhyamika —
For both of us-though on different grounds-it is established that the fruit of karma has to be borne. In both cases, i.e. performing karma and bearing its 'phala', the self is unconcerned or inactive. Hence, the controversy is meaningless.

Those of the Nyaÿa school argue that if the self is not permanent, the relation between action and its fruit would be impossible to establish because karma, whether good or bad, has to bear fruit for the doer. This being an inevitable process, there has to be a self to face the consequences of karma in an after life.

न प्रणश्यन्ति कर्माणि कल्पकोटिशतैरपि।
सामग्री प्राप्य कालं च फलन्ति खलु देहिनाम्।।

The Mādhyamika replies that one premise is common for both the schools, — for the Naiyāyikas as advocates of self and for the Mādhyamikas as advocates of non-self, it is karma 'phala'. The fruit of action is inevitable; it must be borne. But, it is not the same body which performs action here that has to face its 'phala' here-after. The two identities are different, the one who performs the action and the other who reaps the fruit. The two states of existence are different in themselves. And, in both the states, the self is actionless or 'nirvyāpāra', because it neither performs acts nor experiences their results: 'nityatvāta na kvachidapi' kriyāyāma smartha'. So, what is the use of arguing further on this point, asks the Madhyamika.

हेतुमान् फलयोगीति दृश्यते नैष संभवः।
संतानस्यैक्यमाश्रित्य कर्ता भोक्तेति देशितम्।।७३।।

73. That which is causal (i.e. engaged in action)

appears to be deserving of its fruit but this is not possible. The doer (of karma) and the recipient (of 'phala') are only indicated on the basis of the one-ness or the continuity of the individual in several lives.

He who is the cause of action apparently appears to be the recipient of its result also, but finally it is not so for someone dies in this world and another is born: 'anya eva mrito lokay jāyate anya eva hi'. So the causal being does not face the consequence. Who then? And, does this not also contradict the theory that the doer of an act has to enjoy its fruit? Well, Lord Buddha believed in the continuity of the individual in several lives, depending on his karma, responsible for bearing the result of his actions in order that the people at large may not deny the fundamental law of karmic cause and effect but continue to perform 'kuśala karma'. Otherwise, there is certainly no existence of a permanent self or the same individual identity facing the consequence of its actions:

यस्मिन्नेव हि सन्ताने आहिता कर्मवासना।
फल तत्रैव बध्नाति कर्पासे रक्तता यथा।।

अतीतानागतं चित्तं नाहं तद्धि न विद्यते।
अथोत्पन्नमहं चित्तं नष्टेऽस्मिन् नास्त्यहं पुनः।।७४।।

74-75. The mind also cannot be the subject of 'I' or the self, because it is past and unborn and the present (mind) is soon to be destroyed.

यथैव कदलीस्तंभो न कश्चिद् भागशः कृतः।
तथाहमप्यसद्भूतो मृग्यमाणो विचारतः।।७५।।

Just as the trunk of a plantain tree cannot be torn into parts, so also, when thoroughly inevestigated or reflected upon, there is no basis for a truly existent self.

The self can neither be the mind of the past, which is dead, nor of the future, which is yet to be born. Now, there can be the third mind also, it may be argued,-the mind of the present. But when even this present mind is destroyed, as is likely very soon, it too becomes a thing of the dead past. So, where does the self abide? What sort of mind of these three types-past, present and future-has to be grasped by the self? Thus, even the mind is not a prop for the self. There is no basis for self at all. Śāntideve cites on excellent similitude. The trunk of the banana tree can only be peeled off layer after layer, it cannot be torn asunder into parts. So also, when peeled off layer after layer, the investigation of self or 'ahama' leads no-where. It is like the search for the son of a barren woman; it has no basis in 'paramārtha'.

यदि सत्त्वो न विद्येत कस्योपरि कृपेति चेत्।
कार्यार्थमभ्युपेतेन यो मोहेन प्रकल्पितः ।।७६।।

76. Vijñanvādi —
If there is no existence of a sattva (as self), on whom is compassion to be practised?
Mādhyamika—
On those who, for the practical purpose (of samvriti-satya) exist or who (out of consideration) need to be corrected for their ignorance.

The Vijnānavādi poses a pertinent question: if there were no beings, on whom could compassion be practised? The Mādhyamika replies that 'karuna' or compassion is the be-all and end-all of a bodhisattva's exis-

tence. And, what can, if at all, be the prop or 'ālambana' for his compassion? Actually, there is no true existence of 'sattvas'. However, one should practise compassion on those 'sattvas' or sentient beings who, out of their mind's ignorance or out of their delusion deserve to be the objects of the dispensation of 'karunā' for all practical purposes. Compassion is only initially dependent on 'sattvas' or 'sattvalambana;' then it becomes 'dharmālambana' and finally 'anālambana' or without a prop. Ārya Avalokiteśvara bodhisattva once said to the Lord. "O master, a bodhisattva should not be instructed on many dharmas. A single dharma (i.e. compassion) is to be avowed and voluntarily practised by a bodhisattva. This brings all other dharmas in the palm of his hand. A bodhisattva who possesses 'mahākarunā' will have all other buddha-dharmas flock to him."

कार्यं कस्य न चेत्सत्वः सत्यमीहा तु मोहतः ।
दुःखव्युपशमार्थं तु कार्यमोहों न वार्यते । ।७७ । ।

77. Vijnānavādi —
If there is no 'sattva' or sentient being, for whose sake is the act (of compassion)?

Mādhyamikas —
No doubt the effort ('eēhā') is out of 'moha' or love (for apparently existing beings). The love for action (i.e. showing compaṣsion) cannot be refrained from for the sake of reducing 'dukha' or suffering.

The 'sattvas' exist only as a 'samvriti satya' and not as a 'paramārtha satya' because of the non-truly existent nature of beings. The effort to show compassion towards such sattvas may also be termed as the esult of a deceptive delusion about their being truly existent. Even so

the effort is worthwhile because it helps reduce the suffering of beings even if, in the ultimate truth, they do not exist. Hence, the conclusion is that unless compassion or 'karunā' is practised for the sake of 'samvriti satya' one cannot reach the realisation of 'parmārtha satya'. It is for this reason that the urge for compassion should not be warded off.

दुःखहेतुरहङ्कार आत्ममोहात्तु वर्धते।
ततोऽपि न निवर्तयश्चेत्वरं नैरात्म्यभावना।।७८।।

78. I — ness or ego is the (root) cause of suffering and it is augmented by the delusion about self. And, when this ego is not warded off even after that (i.e. seeing the self or ātmā-darśana), it is better to cultivate(the ideal of) non-self or 'nairatmya'.

Undoubtedly, ego is the root cause of suffering and the concept of self only aggravates the ego: 'ya paśyatiātmānam tasyātrāhamiti diāśvata-sneha'. Therefore, the practice of non-soul or identityless-ness alone can create proper detachment or ego-less-ness, a state of stability and non-kleśas and 'pratitya-sumtpāda'. It has been said in the Tathāgata-guhya-sūtra: If you cut off the roots of a tree, its branches and leaves will automatically wither away. So also will 'kleśas' fade away when a person has attained the peace of identity-less-ness or 'nairatamya'

कायो न पादौ न जंघा नोरू कायः कटिर्न च।
नोदरं नाप्ययं पृष्ठं नोरू बाहू न चापि सः।।७९।।

79-80. The body is not the feet, nor the waist, nor the stomach, nor the back or the chest or the arms.

न हस्तौ नाप्ययं पार्श्वौ न कक्षौ नासंलक्षणः ।
न ग्रीवा न शिरः कायः कायोऽत्र कतरः पुनः ।।८० ।।

It is not the hands, not the feet, nor the biceps, nor the aggregate of habits nor the neck or the head. Then, what or where is the body?

After arguing about 'pudgal-nairātmya', Śāntideva goes on to expound 'dharma nairātmya'. First, he deals with 'smrityupasthāna' of the body or 'kāyā'. Generally, the human body is regarded as a single entity, whereas, in actual fact, it is not so. None of the many parts of the body can severally be called the body. It is only their 'samudāya' or conglomeration which is erroneously termed as the body. There is no truly existent body in any of these parts.

यदि सर्वेषु कायोऽयमेकदेशेन वर्तते ।
अंशा अंशेषु वर्तन्ते स च कुत्र स्वयं स्थितः ।।८१ ।।

81-82. If the body is simultaneously present in all the limbs, in what limb is it present in what proportion? Parts (of the body) remain in their proper places, but where does it (i.e. the body) stay?

सर्वात्मना चेत्सर्वत्र स्थितः कायः करादिषु ।
कायास्तावन्त एव स्युर्यावन्तस्ते करादयः ।।८२ ।।

If the body is present in all the limbs like hands, etc. there should be as many bodies as limbs.

How come that the body be present in all the limbs and

be itself too as an independent entity? It could not be related to them in toto and be apart from them also simultaneously. Parts of the body are where they are, but it cannot be pinpointed as to which part of the body is body itself. If it is omnipresent in all limbs, it will stay only till such time as those limbs stay; it will be divided in parts and not remain as one. So, there will be as many bodies as limbs and that makes for a very ludicrous situation which is totally unrelated to reality.

नैवान्तर्न बहिः कायः कथं कायः करादिषु।
करादिभ्यः पृथग् नास्ति कथं तु खलु विद्यते।।८३।।

83-85. There is no body from inside nor from outside. How could then the body be in hands, etc. And, because it is not separate either from hands etc. how can a separate entity for it be established?

तन्नास्ति कायो मोहात्तु कायबुद्धिः करादिषु।
संनिवेशविशेषेण स्थाणौ पुरुषबुद्धिवत्।।८४।।

Therefore, the body is not truly existent, but, owing to delusion, hands, etc, are taken as the body. It is like taking an inert object (from a distance) as a human being owing to its conglomerate parts) being so placed.

यावत्प्रत्ययसामग्री तावत्कायः पुमानिव।
एवं करादौ सा यावत् तावत्कायोऽत्र दृश्यते।।८५।।

So long as those conditions continue that (inert) figure will continue to appear as a

man. So also, so long as hands, etc. are in their position, they will continue to give the appearance of a body.

The body is not truly existent but a mental state born of delusion or the 'kāyā-budhi' makes one believe that the body is truly existent. There is no body either in the flesh or the bones or the narrow, nor in the externally manifest limbs. Only a conglomeration of hands and feet, etc. gives it the nomenclature of a body which is, in terms of ultimate truth or 'paramārtha,' unreal. So long as the conditions for creating the illusion remain, the illusion will persist as in the case of an inanimate object appearing as a completely human form in the dark because of the placement of its various components in that illusive posture: 'yāvata pratyaya sāmagri tāvata kāshthama pumāniva.'

एवमङ्गुलिपुंजत्वात्पादोऽपि कतरो भवेत्।
सोऽपि पर्वसमूहत्वात् पर्वापि स्वांशभेदतः।।८६।।

86-88. And, for that matter, where is even the foot (as truly existent) because it too is a collection of fingers. Even that (collection of fingers) is a collection of (finger) joints and the joints themselves are (many) parts in themselves.

अंशान् अप्यणुभेदेन सोऽप्यणुर्दिग्विभागतः।
दिग्विभागो निरंशत्वादाकाशं तेन नास्त्यणुः।।८७।।

Even the parts are divisible into atomic particles and the atomic particles into their directional particles. Even these directional particles, being divided directionally, are as

empty as space and, therefore, the atomic particle too has no true existence.

एवं स्वप्नोपमे रूपे को रज्येत विचक्षणः ।
कायश्चैवं यदा नास्ति तदा का स्त्री पुमांश्च कः ।।८८।।

Hence, what wise man would feel attached to this dream-like form? When the body is nought, what man is man or what woman is woman?

The hands and feet are merely a collection of fingers; fingers, in themselves, are a collection of joints; the joints too comprise different elements or parts. How can, therefore, the hands and feet or other joints be credited with true existence? Even the parts of fingers consist of atomic particles which are further divisible. These atomic particles have their own directional parts, some having a pull in the east, some in the west or north or south or even downward or upward-according to their nature: 'nānā digavasthita nānā rūpamśāh parmāṇo śaḍamśatā.'

Even those atomic particles are not of one nature; they are multiples and capable of being split further and further. Thus even they are not truly existent because the directional parts also get further divided up. They are 'śunya' like space itself in the ultimate analysis. There is no 'anu', no 'paramanu'; there is 'śunyatā' alone due to nissvabhāvata? No wise man should, therefore, be attached to 'rupa' or forms which are just dream-like, illusory. The eye sees an attractive form and loves it. This is called 'saumanasya'. It sees a repulsive form and hates it; this is called 'daurmnasya'. If it sees an indifferent form — which is neither attractive nor repulsive-there is delusion coupled with confusion. But, the wise person who possesses discrimination is not touched by any of these

three reactions because, when the body does not truly exist, who is man or who is woman, who is attractive or who is ugly,. who is that sensual man whose charm attracts a woman?

The Lord says in the Pita-putra samagama: "There are six dhātus, six sparśāyatanas', eighteen 'manopavichāras'; all these attract or blind a person. The six 'dhātus are 'prithvidhātu' (of earth), abdhātu' (of water), 'tejo dhātu' (of light) 'vayu-dhātu' (of air) 'akāśa-dhātu', (of space) and 'vijnāna-dhātu' (of discrimination).

When the six sensory 'sparśāyatanas', which help one see, feel and touch things, are multiplied by the three types of 'anukūla' (favourable), 'pratikula' (contrary) and 'upekśā' (indefferent) alternately termed 'saumanasya', 'daurmanasya' and 'upekśā' or 'rāga, 'devśa' and 'moha' they make eighteen sub-thoughts or 'upa vichāra' of the mind. Everyone of the sense organs experiences these three types of states in respect of forms or 'rupa'. Therefore, it is said; 'yathābhutama samyaka prajnyayā draśtavyama'. That is, every form or phenomena should be viewed with 'prajaña' or wisdom in its reality. Seen in this way, 'śunyatā will be viewed in all states, at every time, in every form.

यद्यस्ति दुःखं तत्त्वेन प्रहृष्टान् किं न बाधते।
शोकाद्यार्ताय मृष्टादि सुखं चेत् किं न रोचते।।८९।।

89. If suffering is truly existent, why does it not affect the happy? And, why is not the joy of luxuries relished by those troubled with sorrow, etc.?

Now comes 'vedanā smrityopsthāna'. Neither suffering nor joy is real or truly existent. If suffering were real it

should affect everyone including those in a state of so-called joy, for 'vedanā' is reputed to be of three kinds-'sukha vedanā, 'dukha vedanā' and 'adukha— sukha vedanā; that is, the feeling of joy, of suffering and of neither joy nor suffering. Why does not 'dukha' affect the contented? Also, persons who are troubled by grief, fear and restlessness do never relish happiness even from such mudane things as good food, good wine and soothing substances like sandal paste, etc. So, even happiness is not truly existent. Both happiness and grief must be regarded as only 'kalpnopsthāpita' or by fancy super-imposed on the mind.

बलीयसाभिभूतत्वाद्यदि तन्नानुभूयते।
वेदनात्वं कथं तस्य यस्य नानुभवात्मता।।९०।।

90. Even if it (i.e., suffering) or joy is not felt because it is overpowered by a strong current of joy or grief, how can it (either suffering or joy) be termed as possessing feeling or 'vedanā' when it is actually devoid of feeling?

'Vedanā' is that which is felt or 'vedayatā, that which is not felt can certainly not be said to possess 'vedanā' or feeling. Anything that is not within the purview of actual experience will remain 'avedayamāna' or unfelt and unexperienced. Therefore, it cannot be termed as 'vedanā'.

अस्ति सूक्ष्मतया दुःखं स्थौल्यं तस्य हृतं ननु।
तुष्टिमात्राऽपरा चेत्स्यात्तस्मात् साप्यस्य सूक्ष्मता।।९१।।

91. Dukha stays in a very subtle form; only its gross or palpable form is removed by the over-riding current of joy. The nature of this (subtle

pain) is too a slight feeling of joy (distinct from a gross feeling of joy).

An overpowering wave of joy can dominate the intensity of gross suffering but the experience of this subtle (sukśama) dukha cannot be equated with total joy, because there is no room for even a fraction of dukha in 'sukha'. A feeling cannot simultaneously be that of both joy and suffering.

विरुद्धप्रत्ययोत्पत्तौ दुःखस्यानुदयो यदि।
कल्पनाभिनिवेशो हि वेदनेत्यागतं ननु।।९२।।

92. If there is no incidence of dukha owing to the generation of contrary causes (like joy), it would amount to mere fancy to call it 'vedaña' or feeling.

The feelings of joy and pain are merely super-imposed by imagination. 'Vedanā' is merely dependent on different 'pratyayas'; it is not independent, not self-existent. A person whose very one word causes pain to us may, in course of time, become even a cause of joyous meeting. Hence pleasure and pain, by themselves, are not truly existent. As it is said:

अहिर्मयूरस्य सुखाय जायते।
विषं विषाभ्यासवतौं रसायनम्।।
भवन्ति चानन्दविशेषहेतवो।
मुखं तुदन्तः करभस्य कण्टकाः।।

That is, the serpent exists for the joy of the peacock; poison is a panacea for those who practise venom-therapy and the teeth of the elephant beautifying the mouth are a source of special joy. Thus, one man's

meat is another man's poison; hence, what is pain and what is joy by itself?

अत एव विचारोऽयं प्रतिपक्षोऽस्य भाव्यते।
विकल्पक्षेत्रसंभूत ध्यानाहारा हि योगिनः।।९३।।

93. 'Vedanā being subject to super-imposition or 'abhiniveśa', the concept of a self-existent 'vedanā' appears to be contradictory. A cure for this mistaken concept is that one should cultivate that state of absorption which comes from the field of investigation or analysis as in the case of a yogi whose only food is 'dhyāna' or meditation.

The yogi reflects and meditates on the nature of all phenomena including 'vedanā'. His only fare is 'dhyāna'. He soundly analyses everything with argument ('tarka') and counter-argument ('vitarka') in his mind and, achieving the poise of 'samādhi', comes to realise the non-existent nature of things. His realisation of this fact arises not from 'kalpnā' or imagination but from reaching a 'vikalpa' through complete absorption because he has realised that 'kalpanābhiniveśa' alone is 'vedanā.

सान्तराविन्द्रियार्थौ चेत्संसर्गः कुत एतयोः।
निरन्तरत्वेऽप्येकत्वं कस्य केनास्तु संगतिः।।९४।।

94. If there is a distance between the sense faculties and objects, where could be the chance for their contact? And, if there is no distance between them, they are of one identity. (In that case) who meets what?

Feeling or 'vedanā' is born of contact or 'sparśa. Con-

tact or touch is born of three factors: the object, the senses and consciousness: "vishayendriya-vijnānām trayanāma sannipatasch sparśa." All contacts are born of six situations. If the six-fold contact from the three-fold factors does not occur, the requisite situational material for 'vedanā' would be obviated. If there is a gap between the sense faculties (like eyes) and their objects or seen form, the chances of contact would be nullified. So, there is no true existence of even 'sparśa' which could be the cause of 'vedanā'. In case there is no 'antara' or distance between the two, they, ipso facto, are identical. In that case, there is none to be contacted nor anyone to make contact.

नाणोरणौ प्रवेशोऽस्ति निराकाशः समश्च सः।
अप्रवेशे न मिश्रत्वममिश्रत्वे न संगतिः।।९५।।

95. One atomic particle cannot enter another atomic particle; they are without space and are equal (in size). When there is no merging, there is no mixing; where there is no mixing there is no complete identification.

There is no contact between atomic particles either, that is, atomic particles of the sense faculty and those of the objects. There is no coalaescing of atomic particles and they have no space inside of them. They are also equal in size. How can these partless atomic particles merge? Consequently, there is no meeting and hence no question of a contact.

निरंशस्य च संसर्गः कथं नामोपपद्यते।
संसर्गे च निरंशत्वं यदि दृष्टं निदर्शय।।९६।।

96. How can there be contact with that which is

indivisible or without parts. In case you are aware of anything (like an atomic particle) which is partless and also contact-worthy, please show it.

If something is partless or indivisible, how can it even merge with anything? Because it is partless, it is unmanifest and invisible and, therefore, indivisible. Well, if there is such an atomic particle which is both part-less and contact-worthy, it may be explained as to how that could be feasible.

विज्ञानस्य त्वमूर्तस्य संसर्गो नैव युज्यते।
समूहस्याप्यवस्तुत्वाद् यथा पूर्वं विचारितम्।।९७।।
तदेवं स्पर्शनाभावे वेदना संभवः कुतः।
किमर्थमयमायासो बाधा कस्य कुतो भवेत्।।९८।।

97-98. There can be no (physical) contact with 'vijnāna' or consciousness because it is unmanifest. And, it has already been considered how even an aggregate (of object, senses and consciousness) is not truly existent.

Thus, contact or 'sparśa' being non-existent, how can 'vedanā' be possible? Why then, all this hectic activity (for joys and comforts) and how and where can one feel pain?

Only a physical object can contact another physical object. A physical object cannot contact a non-physical thing like, 'vijñana' or consciousness, because the latter is unmanifest. It may be argued that at least the aggregate of 'vishaya', indriya and 'vijnāna' may produce an effect of congnitive contact. However, this has already been discussed and argued that even a 'samūha' or aggregate is

not truely existent like the horns of a horse or as in the example of the aggreate of the joints of a finger given earlier. Hence, in the absence of contact, all the bother about obtaining pleasure and discarding pain is meaningless, because both joys and sorrows have no true existence.

यदा न वेदकः कश्चिद् वेदना च न विद्यते।
तदावस्थामिमां दृष्टवा तृष्णे किं न विदीर्यसे।।९९।।

99. When there is no experience of feeling ('vedaña') nor is there 'vedanā' itself, why don't you, o craving! seeing such a situation, split into smithereens?

It has been proved by logic and arguments advanced here-to-fore that there exists neither 'vedanā', nor any 'vedaka'. Who feels what? Both are, as an ultimate truth, non-existent. What is all our craving for, then? Why do people pine for pleasure or wish to shy away from pain? All craving must cease; only then the mind will be stilled.

दृश्यते स्पृश्यते चापि स्वप्नमायोपमात्मना।
चित्तेन सहजातत्त्वाद्वेना तेन नेक्ष्यते।।१००।।

100. Things are seen or touched as illusory and dream-like objects by the mind. Having been simultaneously born with consciousness (or the mind), the feelings are not seen by it.

The eye sense may see and the body sense may touch in an apparent act of cognition but such cognition is only subjective in a very limited sense and has no true existence. The cognitive consciousness or the mind sees or touches objects and things as illusory, dream-like, in a

posture of 'pratitya-smutpāda' and not 'paramārtha-sata' The mind or 'jnāna' remains untouched by them because they are not causally related to it. Having been simultaneously born with their illusory cognition they are not seen by the mind.

पूर्वं पश्चाच्च जातेन स्मर्यते नानुभूयते।
स्वात्मानं नानुभवति न चान्येनानुभूयते।।१०१।।

101. Also, past feelings and future feelings can only be recollected (by the mind) but they cannot be experienced. Feeling cannot experience itself nor can another experience it.

'Vedanā' which is by-gone and 'vedana' which is yet to be born cannot be felt by the mind or cognitive consciousness; it can only be remembered as an object of memory. It cannot be the subject of visual perception. It has already been argued that it lacks 'sva-samvedanā' or self-cognition; it cannot feel itself. It cannot also be felt by a simultaneously born 'jñana' or consciousness.

न चास्ति वेदकः कश्चिद् वेदनातो न तत्त्वतः।
निरात्मके कलापेऽस्मिन् क एवं बाध्यतेऽनया।।१०२।।

102. Therefore there exists not either a true experiencer of 'vedanā' or true 'vedanā' itself. This being an identity-less aggregate, what can affect it (by way of pleasure or pain)?

One should cultivate 'vedanā smrityopasthāna' as neither 'vedanā' nor 'vedaka' are truly existent. Pleasure and pain being equally unreal should not be allowed to affect the mind. It has been said in the Akśayamati-sutra:

"Super-imposition is 'vedanā', attachment is 'vedanā', acquisition is 'vedanā.'" In the final analysis, all feelings of joy and sorrow are illusory, unreal, non-existent.

नेन्द्रियेषु न रूपादौ नान्तराले मनः स्थितम्।
नाप्यन्तर्न बहिश्चित्तमन्यत्रापि न लभ्यते।।१०३।।

103-104. The mind does not abide in sense faculties, nor in forms nor in between the two. It does not abide inside or outside or anywhere else.

यन्न काये न चान्यत्र न मिश्रं न पृथक् क्वचित्।
तन्न किंचिदतः सत्त्वाः प्रकृत्या परिनिर्वृताः।।१०४।।

It is neither in the body nor in any other place; it is neither mixed nor apart; it is not truly existent. Therefore, all sattvas by their very nature are prone to nirvana or release.

Now starts an exposition of 'chitta-smritupasthāna', Why do all sentient beings, by their very nature, seek emancipation or release from cyclic existence? It is because the basic fact of the 'nissvabhavatā' of all phenomena is an ingrained element of their psyche. Being inherently conscious of the identity-less-ness of things, their natural tendency is to work for a release from the constraints of birth and death, mind and body, suffering and joy.

ज्ञेयात्पूर्वं यदि ज्ञानं किमालंब्यास्य संभवः।
ज्ञेयेन सह चेद् ज्ञानं किमालंब्यास्य संभवः।।१०५।।'

105-106. If cognition or conscouisness (of sense objects) existed before (the objects of cognition) what was the prop for it? If cognition and its objects came up together what was the prop for this?

अथ ज्ञेयाद् भवेत् पश्चात्तदा ज्ञानं कुतो भवेत्।
एवं च सर्वधर्माणामुत्पत्तिर्नाविसीर्यते।।१०६।।

If cognition came after the objects of cognition (had ceased), whence was this cognition? Hence (the conclusion is that) all phenomena is truly non-arising.

There are two things: the senses that cognise and the objects of their so called cognition. Does cognition, if any, come about simultaneously with or prior to or after the disappearance of objects? In case it is argued that sense cognition existed before the objects of cognition themselves, what else was it, objects or otherwise, which produced such cognitions or consciousness? What was the support for such 'jnāna'? If the objects and their cognition were simultaneously generated, what was the support or basic matrix for such a phenomena? In case such cognition came into being after the objects of cognition had ceased, what was there for the senses to cognate or be conscious of? Expounding 'chitta-smrtyupasthāna', the Ratnakūta-sutra says, "What does please, antogonise or attract that (mind)? Is it the past or the future or the present? That which is past is dead, that which is future is not yet present, that which is present will not stay. O Kaśyapā, the mind is neither inside (the body) nor outside nor in between; the mind is unseeing of forms without blemish, un-fixed, not stationary. It was not seen by any of the Buddhas nor do they see it or will see it. O Kaśyapa! the mind is illusory and seems to grasp different aspects from imagination."

The 'dharma-smritupasthāna' has been so expounded in the Akśyamati-sutra: "The bodhisattva does not see any dharmas or phenomena. Where there is neither bodhi nor 'mārga' nor non-existence, knowing the non-existence of all dharmas, he attains the pure samādhi of 'mahākaruṇa'. He looks on all dharmas and 'kleśas' as artificial. There is no heap collection of kleśas for him, no attachment, no hatred, no desire. Knowing this is 'bodhi'."

यद्येवं संवृतिर्नास्ति ततः सत्यद्वयं कुतः ।
अथ साप्यन्यसंवृत्या स्यात्सत्वो निर्वृत्तः कुतः ।।१०७।।

107. If there is no true existence of even 'samvritti' or apparent truth, how could there be (any talk of) the two truths (i,.e. 'samvritti' and 'paramartha')? Even that 'samvritti' is established by another 'samvritti;' that is, the samvritti' of 'kalpnā' or imagination of another cognition. Then, where is release for sattvas?

This śloka poses a very genuine doubt on behalf of the opponents of Mahāyāna. If, as has been argued, even 'samvritti satya' is not truly existent, it is irrelevant to speak of the so called two levels of truth, that is, 'samvritti' and 'parmārtha'-the apparent and the ultimate. In the absence of such a concept there will be no 'para-loka-gamana', 'karma kriyā-phala-sambandha' and 'svabhavo-pārjana', next birth, causal relationship between action and result and accumulation of subjective feeling because of the absence of all 'vyavahāra' or transaction. It is only when one notices a mirage that one's understanding is established in reality or truth. Ultimate truth can only be born out of illusory truth. Even 'samvritti satya' can be established by another illusory truth alone, that is, the 'samvritti' of imagination in the garb of 'buddhi' or intel-

lect. Even though, in terms of ultimate truth, it is 'nissvabhāva' or not-truly-existent, yet it is termed as 'samvritti' owing to the intellect taking recourse to 'kalpanā' or imagination. 'Buddhi' is always 'samvritti', because its very nature is 'kalpanā. Therefore, in the case of sentient beings, even their 'nivritti' or 'nirvāna' becomes 'samvritti. How could beings pass from a state of sorrow into emancipation when their 'buddhi' remains so deceived"?

परचित्तविकल्पोऽसौ स्वसंवृत्या तु नास्ति सः ।
स पश्चान्नियत : सोऽस्ति न चेन्नास्त्येव संवृतिः ।।१०८ ।।

108. This (distortion of intellect) emanates from another being's 'samvritti' and not from his own (being a 'nivritta' or emancipated) being. As such, because his 'samvritti' is of dependent origination, it is not really 'samvritti' or distorted conception (in his case).

The Mādhyamika replies that a person who has attained a state of emancipation cannot be held guilty of any distorted conception of truth as his samvritti is really not his; it emanates from another being. He is an emancipated being only because he has over-come all distorted conceptions. This state of nirvāna is a constant and unchanging state. He is not fettered by anybody else's 'samvritti'. Therefore, such a one is without any 'kalpanā' which alone superimposes an 'āvarana' or cover over truth. Even though embraced by a 'samvritti' arising from other beings or phenomena, he is in a 'parinivritta' or released state at all times. For him all phenomena are 'śāntāh' or eternally quiet and naturally unfettered or 'prakriti' parinivrittāh' owing to the absence of all 'kalpanā' or imagination. It is said in the Lalitavistara: "Samskāras are of the nature of the wick of a lamp-easy

to light and easy to put out. They are unsteady, are flippant like the wind, weak and unfounded like foam; samskāras are desireless and void and unsee-able like a plantain trunk, alluring like illusion, empty like the closed fist of a child."

The Chattustavam says: there is no origination of the eternal nor no origination of the ephemeral, O noble one! The knōwers of reality have spoken of it as dream-like."

Finally speaking, all phenomena are non-originating (anutpanna') and unfettered ('aniruddha'); hence there is neither jnāna' nor 'jneya'. Silence is the word, void is the answer.

कल्पना कल्पितं चेति द्वयमन्योन्यनिश्रितम्।
यथाप्रसिद्धमाश्रित्य विचारः सर्व उच्यते।।१०९।।

109. Since imagination and the imagıned object are interdependent, all our idea (or well-analysed thought) is expressed on the basis of conventional analogy.

'Kalpanā or imagination is nothing but 'āropīta buddhi' or super-imposed intellect. Since imagination and imagined subjects are interdependent, it follows that just as the objects do not truly exist so also does not 'kalpanā' or the mental faculty to imagine. This is valid to the extent that the analysis or 'vichāra' or idea based on conventional and well-accepted methods is always accepted as valid in the world

विचारितेन तु यदा विचारेण विचार्यते।
तदानवस्था तस्यापि विचारस्य विचारणात्।।११०।।

110. If that which has been analysed is further analysed the (unending) process will lead to de-stabilisation, because the last conclusion will have to be further probed.

A question is posed: when the intellect, on due analysis, concludes a dharma or phenomena to be without true existence, it will require further analysis in case that cognitive consciousness is also doubtful and not truly existent. This process of examination, investigation, analysis, re-analysis will create a vicious circle which, in turn, will lead to the erosion of the stability of conclusions arrived at. The answer to this question is provided in the next śloka.

विचारिते विचार्ये तु विचारस्यास्ति नाश्रयः ।
निराश्रयत्वान्नोदेति तच्च निर्वाणमुच्यते ।।१११ ।।

111. When an object (of analysis) has been fully analysed, there is left no further basis for any analysis. Divested of a basis, there is no generation (of a truly existent consciousness). That, indead, is called 'nirvāna'.

The Mādhyamika replies, "There is no 'anavasthā dośa', because no truly existent base for a further analysis is left after the analytic consciousness has thoroughly examined a phenomena. In the absence of a truly existent basis, there can be no generation of a truly cognitive consciousness any further. This state in which the true nature of reality dawns as 'śunyatā' and in which there is no feeling of attachment but that of absolute contentment, is the state of 'nirvāna'.

यस्य त्वेतद् द्वयं सत्यं स एवात्यन्तदुःस्थितः ।
यदि ज्ञानवशादर्थो ज्ञानास्तित्वे तु का गतिः ।।११२ ।।

112-114. He who believes both these to have true existence places himself in an unenviable position. If cognition pre-supposes an object of cognition, what will establish (the true existence of) cognition?

अथ ज्ञेयवशाज्ज्ञानं ज्ञेयास्तित्वे तु का गतिः ।
अथान्योन्यवशात्सत्वमभावः स्याद्व्योरपि ।।११३ ।।

If cognition is established by its object, how could (the true existence of) the object (of cognition) be established?

पिता चेन्न विना पुत्रात्कुतः पुत्रस्य संभवः ।
पुत्राभावे पिता नास्ति तथा सत्वं तयोर्द्वयोः ।।११४ ।।

If there cannot be a father without a son, how can there be a son without a father? just as the son and the father are interdependent, so also these two (cognition and its object) cannot exist without each other.

The Vijnanavādi and others posit another question: how can both the cognitive conscious and its object be truly existent? If the existence of consciousness or cognitive faculty pre-supposes the existence of the object of 'jnāna', what is there to establish the existence of cognition? Can what is to be measured be a proof of the measurement itself? It may, alternatively, be argued that cognition is established owing to the objects of cognition. But, how to establish the true existence of objects which are supposed to be the cause of cognition? On the other hand, if it is believed that both are interdependent, the two cannot be truly existent owing to the dependence of

the one on the other just as there can be no father without a son, and vice versa; 'jnāna' and 'gneya', thus, become 'asattva' or non-existent.

अंकुरो जायते बीजाद् बीजं तेनैव सूच्यते।
ज्ञेयाज्ज्ञानेन जातेन तत्सत्ता किं न गम्यते।।११५।।

115. The sprout is born of the seed and it is a proof of the existence of the seed; (similarly), why cannot cognition of 'jnāna' be a proof of the existence of the object or 'jneya'?

A counter-question is posed in this śloka through the example of the seed and the sprout. Even if the sprout is dependent on the seed, its presence is a positive proof of the existence of the seed. In the same manner, why cannot cognition be taken as a proof of the existence of its object? The Mādhyamika answers in the next śloka.

अंकुरादन्यतो ज्ञानाद् बीजमस्तीति गम्यते।
ज्ञानास्तित्वं कुतो ज्ञातं ज्ञेयं यत्तेन गम्यते।।११६।।

116. It is another cognition, different from that of the sprout, which tells that the seed exists. How can the (true) existence of cognitive consciousness ('jnāna') be understood as having arisen from a (truly) existent object?

The Mādhyamika replies that the example of the sprout and the seed is fallacious, because it is not the sprout but the cognition that there must be a seed which makes one conscious of the existence of the seed. So, it is a different cognition from the one which observed the sprout. There is no such thing as a truly existent cognition.

लोकः प्रत्यक्षतस्तावत्सर्वं हेतुमुदीक्षते।
पद्मनालादि भेदो हि हेतुभेदेन जायते।।११७।।

117-118. People see face to face the cause or 'hetu' of all phenomena. The variety in the lotus stalks etc. is produced by a variety of causes.

किंकृतो हेतुभेदश्चेत् पूर्वहेतुप्रभेदतः।
कस्माच्चेत्फलदो हेतुः पूर्वहेतुप्रभावतः।।११८।।

How come the variety of causes? Because of a variety of previous causes. And, how is a particular cause capable of producing a particular result? Again, because of the effect of previous or former causes.

Now Śāntideva proceeds to rebut the beliefs of sŏme other schools such as those who believe in 'ahetuka' or non causal existence of phenomena or phenomena arising out of their own nature without a cause. They believe that such objects of variegated beauty as lotus stems,-saffron, etc.-are created of their own volition in slushy pools without a cause. Who has, they argue, created the beautiful moon-disc print on a peacock's feathers? Or, why are thorns so prickly? Thus, according to them, without 'hetu' or cause is born this various and enchanting universe. However, the Mādhyamika retorts that this thesis of a non-causal phenomena is negated by the daily observations of common beings who often perceive the cause apparent before their eyes. The variety in the lotus stems, etc. is the result of a variety of causes or a variation of causes. A definite cause alone is capable of producing a determined effect and this variety of 'hetus' is the result of other and previous causes. These varying and particu-

lar causes again produce their particular results also because of the influence of previous causes. Therefore, there can be no non-causal phenomena whatsoever.

इश्वरो जगतो हेतुः वद कस्तावदीश्वरः ।
भूतानि चेद्भवत्वेवं नाममात्रेऽपि किं श्रमः ।।११९ ।।

119. If you say that 'Īśwara' is the cause of the world, pray explain who this 'Īśwara' is. If the answer is the elements, why make all this fuss about a name?

Those of the Nyaya school and of the Vaiseśi'ka school of philosophy, like most Hindu schools, believe in an eternal cause, like 'Īśwara' or God, as the source of all phenomena. Śāntideva asks them to elaborate their concept of a supreme being as the eternal cause. If their answer is that the 'bhutas' or the elements like earth, water, air, etc. are God, he has no quarrel with them, for the Madhyamikas too believe in the elements. But, he asks, as to why these elements should be clubbed under the designation 'Īśwara'?

अपि त्वनेकेऽनित्याश्च निश्चेष्टा न च देवताः ।
लङ्घ्याश्चाशुचयश्चैव क्ष्मादयो न स ईश्वरः ।।१२० ।।

120-123. Also, these elements like earth are of multiple natures,-impermanent, inert, not divine, treadable, unclean. They are not 'Īśwara'.

नाकाशमीशो ऽचेष्टत्वान्नात्मा पूर्वनिषेधतः ।
अचिन्त्यस्य च कर्तृत्वमप्यचिन्त्यं किमुच्यते ।।१२१ ।।

The sky is not Īśwara being too listless, nor is the self, that (thesis) having been already refuted. If Īśwara is inexplicable, his functions cannot be conceptualised.

तेन किं स्रष्टुमिष्टं च आत्मा चेन्नन्वसौ ध्रुवः।
क्ष्मादिस्वभाव ईशश्च ज्ञानं ज्ञेयादनादि च।।१२२।।

What is sought to be created by him (i.e. God)? If (the answer is) the self or 'atmā', it is not eternal. If the elements like earth are 'Īśwara'-like and permanent, there is no question of a creator and the created between them.

कर्मणः सुखदुःखे च वद किं तेन निर्मितम्।
हेतोरादिर्न चेदस्ति फलस्यादिः कुतो भवेत्।।१२३।।

Tell me what he has created in the context of joys and sorrows born of karma. How can there be 'phala' or result if there is no beginning or 'hetu'?

Elements like earth, air, light and sky cannot be designated as Īśwara because they suffer from many disabilities. They are not eternal; they are insenate, inert; they can be trodden upon, are unclean and certainly not divine, whereas Īśwara is reputed by the believers to be one and eternal, conscious and clean, invariable and unsullied. The sky too is inert; hence it cannot be an attribute of god-hood.

How can he be defined or conceived when he is declared to be in-conceivable? If the self is permanent, why need it be created by an Īśwara who is also permanent?

So created, it cannot be permanent either. Cognition is born of various objects of cognition, hence that too is not a creation of Īśwara. Joys and sorrows are the fruit of good or bad karma; what has Iswara to do with this causalty? What does he create?

कस्मात् सदा न कुरुते नहि सोऽन्यमपेक्षते।
तेनाकृतोऽन्यो नास्त्येव तेनासौ किमपेक्षताम्।।१२४।।

124-125. Why doesn't he (i.e. Īśwara) ever keep busy in activity? He does not depend on any other (extraneous conditions). Nothing, which is not created by him, exists. What other factors should he depend upon (to act)?

अपेक्षते चेत्सामग्रीं हेतुर्न पुनरीश्वरः।
नाकर्तुमीशः सामग्रयां न कर्तुं तदभावतः।।१२५।।

In case this Īśwara depends upon other factors these latter are the cause (of action) and not he. When the relevant conditions or factors are present, he cannot but act; when these are absent, he cannot act.

Īśwara, as being permanent and the cause of all creation, should be constantly engaged in activity. To believe that although eternal, he has to act while depending on occasional conditions as they arise, would be illogical. But, why should Īśwara have to depend on extraneous conditions when he is all powerful or 'smartha-svabhāva.' And, because he is the creator, no other conditions in the world can exist except those created by him. In case he has to depend upon other factors, he is not Īśwara, the

all powerful. If you have to produce cloth you have to depend upon the loom, the thread, etc. without which there will be no cloth. In that case; the loom and the thread are the relevant factors and not merely the dependent you. Īśwara, being dependent on extraneous conditions, cannot but be a dependent entity. If the requiste 'pratyayas' exist he cannot but create, if they don't he can do nothing as in the case of the barren woman's son.

करोत्यनिच्छन्नीशश्चेत्परायत्तः प्रसज्यते ।
इच्छन्नपीच्छायत्तः स्यात् कुर्वतः कुत ईशता ।।१२६।।

126. If Īśwara so acts, even though unwillingly, he is to be termed as dependent. If he acts willingly even then he is not independent.

Īśwara is certainly not independent when he acts or creates, even though not wishing to create, under the effect of available 'pratyayas' or factors. Being dependent, how can he be the omnipotent supreme you talk of? If Īśwara creates with a wilful desire to do so, he is dependent on desire and so he cannot be credited with 'aiśvarya' or supremacy.

येऽपि नित्यानणून्नाहु स्तेऽपि पूर्वं निवारिताः ।
सांख्याः प्रधानमिच्छन्ति नित्यं लोकस्य कारणम् ।।१२७।।

127-128. (The theory of) those who advocate this (world and its creation) as created out of atomic particles has already been refuted. The Sāmkhyas believe the primal substance (i.e. 'prakriti') to be the eternal cause or creation.

सत्वं रजस्तमश्चेति गुण। अविषमस्थिताः ।
प्रधानमिति कथ्यन्ते विषमैर्जगदुच्यते ।।१२८ ।।

The three 'gunas'- 'sattva', 'rajasa' and 'tamasa' stay in a state of imbalance. This combination of the ('gunas') is called 'prakriti' or the primal substance. The world is born out of imbalances.

Those of the Vaiseśika school of philosophy speak of the atomic particles as responsible for all creation. This postulate has already been refuted in an earlier discussion on atomic particles. It needs no repetition. Those of the Sāmkhya school of philosophy believe that 'prakriti' is the primal factor which creates the 'jagata'. When the three 'gunas'-sattva, 'rajasa' and tamasa'- attain a state of natural balance, the world is created. Their various combinations and permutations create all the variety of creations. When the eagerness (autsukyama) of the 'purusha' joins the 'prakriti', creation is the result. The five karma-senses, five buddhi-senses and the mind constitute a total of eleven senses; there are five 'tanmātras' comprising speech, touch form, and smell. From these emanate the five elements of sky, earth, air, fire and water. The eternal 'prakr:ti' is the cause and these sixteen 'gunas' or groups are the 'kārya' or creation. This is what the Šamkhyas say.

एकस्य त्रिस्वभावत्वमयुक्तं तेन नास्ति तत् ।
एवं गुणा न विद्यन्ते प्रत्येकं तेऽपि हि त्रिधा ।।१२९ ।।

The Madhyamika —

129-130. It is not feasible for the one to be tri-natured. Therefore it (i.e. 'prakriti') is actually non-existent. Even the (three) 'gunas'

do not exist, because they too are of three aspects each.

गुणाभावे च शब्दादेरस्तित्वमतिदूरतः ।
अचेतने न च वस्त्रादौ सुखादेरप्यसंभवः ।।१३०।।

In the absence of the three 'guṇas'; the existence of things like sound is totally impossible. It is also not possible for such objects as insensate cloth to have any feeling of joy, etc.

The Mādhyamika replies:"If the one or 'pradhāna' i.e. the primal substance, is accredited with three 'gunas' or qualities it cannot be called 'paramārtha sata' or truly existent." How can the one be three-natured? Well,' in that case, he is not the one. Even the 'gunas', being of three types, cannot be 'paramārtha sata' and, in their being not truly existent, there is no question of 'śabda' or speech, etc. being truly existent. Even if it is believed that everything has three qualities, why cannot each of these three 'gunas' be severally constituted of further three qualities and so on? Therefore, in the absence of the three 'gunas' as the cause, the existence of things like sound or words is totally impossible. It is also not possible for such objects as inert cloth to have 'vedanā' or sensation (of pleasure or pain). Although these objects may be taken to be manifestations of the so called 'prakriti' but, being unconscious, they cannot be affected by its so-called 'gunas'.

तद्धेतुरूपा भावाश्चेन्ननु भावा विचारिताः ।
सुखाद्येव च ते हेतुः न च तस्मात्पटादयः ।।१३१।।

131-132. If you think that inert things like cloth have the nature of pleasure, etc. this

aspect has already been discussed. For you, their (i.e. of cloth, etc.) the 'hetu' or cause is pleasure, etc., but cloth, etc. are certainly born of 'prakriti' (because of the latter's non-existence).

पटादेस्तु सुखादि स्यात्तदभावात्सुखाद्यसत्।
सुखादीनां च नित्यत्वं कदाचिन्नोपलभ्यते।।१३२।।

Pleasure etc. are born of cloth etc. but cloth etc. being not truly existent, pleasure etc. also do not really exist. And, there is no permanence of pleasure etc. visible.

It is wrong to think that inert things like cloth and sandal paste etc. can feel pleasure or pain for being associated with the three 'gunas'. This has already been discussed in the context of the human body and its limbs as not having true existence. And, things like cloth etc. are not composed of limbs or atomic particles like the human body. Hence they are not affected by 'gunas'. Cloth etc. are not the effect but the cause of pleasure whereas pleasure etc. cannot also be regarded permanent feelings.

सत्यामेव सुखव्यक्तौ संवित्तिः किं न गृह्यते।
तदेव सूक्ष्मतां याति स्थूलं सूक्ष्मं च तत्कथम्।।१३३।।

The Mādhyamika —

133-134 If happiness were always apparently existent why is it not constantly experienced? The Sāmkhya- (at that time of pain) it (i.e. pleasure) assumes a subtle state. The Mādhyalmika asks. "How can the same thing be both gross and subtle?"

स्थौल्यं त्यकत्वा भवेत्सूक्ष्ममनित्ये स्थौल्यसूक्ष्मते।
सर्वस्य वस्तुनस्तद्वत्किं नानित्यत्वमिष्यते।।१३४।।

The Madhyamika continues —
Because it gives up its gross nature and becomes subtle, it is impermanent, being alternately gross and subtle. Why do't you, then, accept (this principle of) impermanence for all other phenomena also?"

The Mādhyamika asks, "If joy were an ever-existing phenomena, why should it be alternated with pain. Why is it not uninterruptedly experienced?" The Sāmkhya replies, "Even when pain is in pre-ponderance, joy only gets under; the latter does not totally disappear but assumes a very, very subtle form just as the stars, although present in the sky, cannot be seen during daylight". The Mādhyamika further asks, "How is it possible for the same thing to wear a two-way stance simultaneously? It can either be one or the other, It cannot be both gross and subtle at the same time. If it really alternates like that, it cannot be called permanent or 'nitya'. it certainly is 'anitya'. Accordingly, it would be wisdom to regard all other dharmas also as impermanent."

न स्थौल्यं चेत्सुखादन्यत् सुखस्यानित्यता स्फुटम्
नासदुत्पद्यते किंचिदसत्त्वादिति चेन्मतम्।।१३५।।

135-138. If the gross manifestation (of joy) is not different from joy, impermanence of 'sukha' itself is clearly apparent. If you believe that nothing is born out of nothingness even unintentionally the manifest does stay (dormant in the

unmanifest) before its birth (in gross form).

व्यक्तस्यासत उत्पत्तिरकामस्यापि ते स्थिता।
अन्नादोऽमेध्यभक्षः स्यात् फलं हेतौ यदि स्थितम्।।१३६।।

(When the above conclusion of the Sāmkhyas is stretched) would it be proper to say that in eating food, one is eating excreta if the 'phala' or result is (taken as) dormant in the 'hetu' or cause?

पटार्घेणैव कर्पासबीजं क्रीत्वा निवस्यताम्।
मोहाच्चेन्नेक्षते लोकः तत्त्वज्ञस्यापि सा स्थितिः।।१३७।।

Why don't you, then, make do with buying cotton seeds for weaving (as cloth) with your money instead of (buying) cloth? He who knows the reality is really aware of it (i.e. the cloth is dormant in the cotton seed) but people do not realise this factor owing to delusion.

लोकस्यापि च तज्ज्ञानमस्ति कस्मान्न पश्यति।
लोकप्रमाणतायां च व्यक्तदर्शनमप्यसत्।।१३८।।

Even a common person has that knowledge (i.e. that the act is in the cause). How do you say that he does not see (it)? And, if you say that 'loka-jnāna' or commonplace knowledge is no (conclusive) proof, much of seen or manisfest knowledge will become equally non-existent.

The Mādhyamika continues: — "If the gross manifestation of pleasure had been apart from pleasure, the latter would have been capable of being experienced even in the absence of its gross aspect. Hence a clear experience of pleasure need not be termed gross. If the two are inseparable, the absence of its gross form will surely make pleasure also absent or non-existent. The fruit is dormant in the seed, the result in the cause. When the result is manifest it is called 'utpatti' or creation. But you Sāmkhyas call it unmanifest and manifest state of the same. From this type of logic it should follow that a person eating food is, in fact, eating excreta, or that a person wishing to buy cloth should buy only cotton seeds and wear them instead. The Sāmkhya says that it is their delusion that does not allow people to see cotton cloth in the cotton seed; the seer of reality is aware of this fact. The manifest result does stay in the unmanifest cause till it takes on a gross form at birth. The Mādhyamika's answer is: "If the knower of reality is so aware, why doesn't he wear only cotton seeds instead of cotton cloth? Why cannot the common people see that the result is dormant in the cause? If they do not know it owing to their vision being clouded, even their view of manifest phenomena should be regarded as illusory and non-existent. That is, if they cannot see the result in the unmanifest cause their view of manifest result may be equally misconceived and untrue. If common knowledge is no proof in one case, how can it be in the other?"

प्रमाणमप्रमाणं चेन्ननु तत्प्रमितं मृषा।
तत्त्वतः शून्यता तस्माद् भावानां नोपपद्यते।।१३९।।

The Sāmkhya —

139. If (according to your argument) even a (manifest) proof (of cognition) is no proof, even 'śunyatā' as a final truth, does not stand the

test of proof and is, therefore, untouchable.

The Sāmkhya retorts, "when you regard even manifest proof as no proof and take all phenomena to be mere deceptions from the angle of 'paramārtha', where does your concept of void or 'Śunyatā' stand in this context? Your concept of 'nisvabhāvatā' of all dharmas is also an unreliable premise for lack of proof. From the point of view of justice and fair-play, the touchstone of proof-worthiness should be applied to both sides."

कल्पितं भावमस्पृष्ट्वा तद्भावो न गृह्यते।
तस्माद् भावो मृषा यो हि तस्याभावः स्फुटं मृषा।।१४०।।

The Mādhyamika —

140-141 Without being in touch with imagined true-existence, one cannot grasp the meaning of true non-existence. Therefore, true non-existence is also as false as imagined true existence.

तस्मात्स्वप्ने सुते नष्टे स नास्तीति विकल्पना।
तद्भावकल्पनोत्पादं विबध्नाति मृषा च सा।।१४१।।

So also the death of a son in a dream is the 'vikalpa' or alternative to his existence. The fact of his existence being overcast by imagination (in a false dream) troubles him even though it is false.

It is not easy to grasp the 'śunyatā' or non-existence of a phenomena without imaginning its so-called true existence. It is essential to understand what that so-called self is in order to realise 'nairātamya' or no-self. Therefore, when the imagined truth is non-existent, the truth

of non existence also looks false. Then, why meditate on 'Śunyatā'? Because, that alone will help eliminate any apprehension of true existence. That alone will lead to supreme bodhi or knowledge. When a person sees in a dream that his son has died, the thought of his son's existence vanishes with the current thought of his death in the dream. Actually, the idea of the son's non-existence is false being only a dream, but even this false premise makes a person give up the non-false fact of his existence. Hence all phenomena must be viewed as imagined, non-existent and untrue. The waking and the dream states are alike in this regard. Therefore even in the absence of a manifest proof, there is no challenging the theory of 'sarva-dharma-nissvabhāvatā.' Says Nagarjuna in his Chatustva:

उत्पन्नश्च स्थितो नष्ट उक्तो लोकोऽर्थतस्त्वया।
कल्पनामात्रमित्यस्मात्सर्वधर्माः प्रकाशिताः।।
कल्पनाप्यसती प्रोक्ता यथा शून्यं विकल्प्यते।।।

तस्मादेवं विचारेण नास्ति किंचिदहेतुतः।
न च व्यस्तसमस्तेषु प्रत्ययेषु व्यवस्थितम्।।१४२।।

142. Therefore analysing like this, it can be concluded that nothing exists without a cause, there is also no single cause nor dual or plural causes of phenomena.

'Bhāvas' are not born of their own nature. Due to the absence of that 'svabhāva' or nature before its birth, whence can be birth from a non-existent thing? When born, what can be born of that which is really 'niśpanna' or already arisen, produced. Moreover, that which is born is sure to be reborn which is natural because of the link between the deed and the cause. Nor are 'bhāvas'

born of others, because whilst desirous of being born of others, the 'kodrava' (paspalum scrobiculatum) shoot could as well hope to be born of a 'śāli' (rice seed). Thus this otherness of a cause disappears as in the case of the contradiction inherent in the rice seed producing that ordinary species of grain called 'kodrava'. This is true of all phenomena. There is neither a self-cause nor another cause to generate 'bhāvas'. It may be argued that, now that this otherness of a cause has disappeared, can it not be that everything is born of the fundamental law of cause and action wherein, through inter-action, the cause is followed by effect, the producer by the produced?. No, it is not so. When the 'karya' or action is unborn or unproduced, where is its force left? Nor can there be a transgression of the law of cause and effect due to the cause and the effect being of a differing time. Therefore, because there is no possibility of even a single 'kārya' without 'kārana', there cannott be transgression in respect of even one effect.

Nor a 'bhāva' is born of both; that is, the 'bhāva' and the 'bhavābhāva', when considered in the context of the draw-backs of either side and because of the incapacity of both 'bhava' and 'abhava' to produce anything. A road which has not been seen by even one blind person cannot have been seen by many blind persons. Hence, even considering the faults of both sides, both are incapable of generating anything.

To sum up: there is nothing which is self-born ('sva-janita') or other-born ('para-janita') or born of both these causes ('ubhaya-janita') or born without a cause ('ahetu-janita').

अन्यतो नापि चायानं तिष्ठति न गच्छति।
मायातः को विशेषोऽस्ययन्मूढ़ैः सत्यतः कृतम्।।१४३।।

143-144 It (i.e. phenomena) has not come from anywhere else nor does it stay put nor does it go away (on cessation). Then, what is special about it that it i.e. (phenomena) is understood as truly existent by ignorant people out of delusion.

मायया निर्मितं यच्च हेतुभिर्यच्च निर्मितम्।
आयाति तत्कुतः कुत्र याति चेति निरूप्यताम्।।१४४।।

It should be examined as to where-from these phenomena come and where they go to after cessation- the phenomena which are created either by delusion or by causes.

In fact, there is nothing special about apparent phenomena in relation to their non-true existence as in the case of the figure of an elephant created through magic. It is the delusion of ignorance of the magic or 'ajnāna' that gives such phenomena a posture actuality. They neither were nor are nor will be for purposes of ultimate reality except that they help in understanding the latter. They do neither truly arise from anywhere nor go anywhere at the end. It must, therefore, be thoroughly investigated as to how they arise at all and where do they go to.

यदन्यसंनिधानेन दृष्टं न तदभावतः।
प्रतिबिम्बसमे तस्मिन् कृत्रिमे सत्यता कथम्।।१४५।।

145-147. That, which is seen only as the result or consequence of something else (i.e. the cause) and not in the latter's absence, is comparable to a reflection. What basis

can be there for an artificial phenomenon (like this)?

विद्यमानस्य भावस्य हेतुना किं प्रयोजनम्।
अथाप्यविद्यमानोऽसौ हेतुना किं प्रयोजनम्।।१४६।।

What use is a cause for phenomena that exist truly. Also, what is the need for a cause if it does not exist at all?

नाभावस्य विकारोऽस्ति हेतुकोटिशतैरपि।
तदवस्थः कथं भावः को वान्यो भावतां गता।।१४७।।

That which does not truly exist cannot be transmuted by even millions of causes or 'hetus'. Being in (that state) of 'not-ness' it cannot change into 'is-ness'.

Things or phenomena which are the result of their causes and which, in the absence of those causes, cannot be born, are not created of their own nature or independently. They are dependent on other 'pratyayas' or causes. Hence they are as false and non-existent as a reflection in a mirror or water. For a truly existent phenomena no pratyaya or 'hetu' is required, because, being 'sata' or true, it existed even before its cause. And, because of its 'nissvabhāvatā', it would need no 'hetu' or cause to create it truly.

नाभावकाले भावश्चेत् कदा भावो भविष्यति।
नाजातेन हि भावेन सोऽभावोऽपगमिष्यति।।१४८।।

148-149. How could a 'bhāva' or phenomena

come into being if there is no 'bhāva' (i.e. is-ness) at the time of 'abhāva' (i.e., is-not-ness)? Without the birth of is-ness' the is-not-ness or 'abhavā' will not be obviated.

न चानपगतेऽभावे भावावसरसंभवः ।
भावश्चाभावतां नैति द्विस्वभावप्रसंगतः ।।१४९ ।।

Unless the state of is-not-ness is removed, it is impossible to generate a state of 'is-ness' or bhāva'. But, a 'bhāva' or is-ness does not become 'abhāva' or is-not-ness' owing to the same thing being incapable of a dual nature.

A thing cannot be said to come into existence without changing its state of non-existence. However, there can be no question of giving up the non-existent state unless something comes into the existent state. Thus there is a standing, mutual contradiction between the two states. Just as an is-ness is incapable of conversion into 'is-not-ness' so also is it true vice versa, otherwise each state will have to be credited with a dual nature which is, logically speaking, an impossibility.

एवं न च निरोधोऽस्ति न च भावोऽस्ति सर्वदा ।
अजातमनिरुद्धं च तस्मात्सर्वमिदं जगत् ।।१५० ।।

150. Therefore, there is neither a permanent cessation nor a true existence of things. Unborn and without cessation is this whole 'jagata'

Without cessation but without true existence is this world. In fact the sanskrit word 'jagata' is from the root

'gama-gachha'-to go. 'Jagata' is that which moves on unceasingly; it has, therefore, no permanence, no true existence. It is said in Dharmasangiti: "there is neither birth nor cessation for all phenomena 'sarvadharmāh notpadyante na nirudhyante'.

Also, Madhyamakārikā says, "Never are things born nor do they exist by themselves, nor from others or from both, nor from no-cause:"

न स्वत्तो नाऽपि परतो न द्वाभ्यां नाप्यहेतुतः ।
उत्पन्ना जातु विद्यन्ते भावाः क्वचन ।।

स्वप्नोप ृतु गतयो विचारे कदलीसमाः ।
निर्वृता ृतानां च विशेषो नास्ति वस्तुतः ।।१५१ ।।

151. All phenomena are comparable to a dream. On analysis they are found to be without substance like a plantain tree. Therefore, in reality, there is no difference between the released and the attached.

The world can be compared to 'māyā' or delusion and, when this delusion is thoroughly probed, the net result is nil just as one fails to get to anything substantial after tearing apart the plantain tree layer after layer. Hence, speaking in the ultimate sense, there is no difference between even the 'nivritta' and the 'a-nivritta' states, between those who have detached themselves from worldly ties and those who are still in fetters. For, in the context of ultimate truth or 'paramārtha', all states of being are without true existence or 'nissvabhāva' and all are naturally prone to 'nirvāna' (release). It is the 'samvritti' aspect that creates the difference whereas in 'paramārtha' there is none.

एवं शून्येषु धर्मेषु किं लब्धं किं हृतं भवेतः।
सत्कृतः परिभूतो वा केन कः संभविष्यतिः।।१५२।।

152-154 Thus, when things are void of existence, what is lost and what gained; who is respected or insulted by whom and how?

कुतः सुखं वा दुःखं वा किं प्रियं वा किमप्रियम्।
का तृष्णा कुत्र सा तृष्णा मृग्यमाणा स्वभावतः।।१५३।।

Wherefrom are pleasure or pain (derived)? What is pleasing, what unpleasing? What is craving or where is that craving which, by nature, is always hankering about.

विचारे जीवलोकः कः को नामात्र मरिष्यति
को भविष्यति को भूतः को बन्धुः कस्य कः सुहृत्।।१५४।।

When analysed, who lives and who dies? Who was and who will be? Who is whose relation; who is whose friend?

A state of total equainimity is achieved through the practice of emptiness. In that state there is no duality. Slight and respect, honour and infamy will not affect such a one. There will be neither elation nor anger nor friend nor foe. Craving, which always hankers after petty, mundane gains, will absolutely cease. In the ultimate analysis, both life and death become meaningless terms, for who lives and who dies? There is neither a past nor a present and no future either. In this way does the practice of 'śunyatā' lead to 'sarvajnatā' or omniscience.

सर्वमाकाशसंकाशं परिगृह्णन्तु मद्विधा
प्रकुप्यन्ति प्रहृष्यन्ति कलहोत्सवहेतुभिः ।।१५५।।

155-157. Let (ignorant) people, who (alternately) get angry or elated when in a quarrel or in a gay situation, accept that all phenomena are (empty) like space.

शोकायासैर्विषादैश्च मिथश्छेदनभेदनैः ।
यापयन्ति सुकृच्छ्रेण पापैरात्मसुखेच्छवः ।।१५६।।

Desiring happiness through evil acts or 'akuśala karma,' people lead a miserable existence through painful exertions and grief, mutual quarrels and killings.

मृताः पतन्त्यपायेषु दीर्घतीव्रव्यथेषु च ।
आगत्यागत्य सुगतिं भूत्वा भूत्वा सुखोचिताः ।।१५७।।

Attaining again and again 'sugati' or good birth (as gods and men) and aspiring after happiness again and again, they fall again and again into interminable and painful existences of lower realms.

With a firm belief in the emptiness of all phenomena all craving for material gains should cease. But, what is seen is that people continue to indulge in unwholesome karma even though desirous of happiness. They quarrel among themselves, mutilate, torture and kill one another, suffer from grief at separation from close relations and friends, weep over lost opportunities and continue to pursue shadows. Through the kindness and noble guidance of a 'kalyāna-mitra', people may attain a good birth even

as men or gods and pass happy days but as a result of their own 'akuśala karma' during those existences, they once again hurl themselves into lower existences, in the realms of 'pretas' and 'tiryakas', ghosts and goblins of hell.

भवे बहुप्रपातश्च तत्र चातत्त्वमीदृशम्।
तत्रान्योन्यविरोधश्च न भवेत्तत्त्वमीदृशम्।।१५८।।

158-161. There are many abysses in the world and there is no comprehension of ultimate reality. Also, there is a mutual divergence of views. Hence there is no realisation of essential truth or ultimate reality.

तत्र चानुपमास्तीव्रा अनन्तादुःखसागराः।
तत्रैवमल्पबलता तत्राप्यल्पत्वमायुषः।।१५९।।

(In the world) there are incomparably limitless oceans of misery; one's strength (for meritorious actions) gets diminished and life span shortened.

तत्रापि जीवितारोग्यव्यापारै क्षुत्क्लमश्रमैः।
निद्रयोपद्रवैर्बालसंसर्गैर्निष्फलैस्तथा।।१६०।।

Also, there (in the world) one indulges in health-giving activities for (a long life's sake), endures hunger, loss and fatigue, suffers the pranks of sleep and the unprofitable society of fools.

वृथैवायुर्वहत्याशु विवेकस्तु सुर्दुलभः ।
तत्राप्यभ्यस्तविक्षेपनिवारणगतिः कुतः ।।१६१ ।।

Swiftly do the years roll by without meaning and 'viveka' or knowledge (of reality) is hard to come by. Whence can there be, then, the effort to award off the tendencies of habit?

In this world of conditioned existence there are many pitfalls, many bottomless abysses, for man; his path is full of obstacles. Hence it becomes very difficult for him to see the reality. His task is made still more difficult by the conflicting theories propounded by various schools of thought and he gets confused in this welter of opinions and counter opinions. In addition, it is a world full of limitless suffering which makes the struggle for existence a very arduous exercise. One's physical and mental strength are both under tremendous strain and, mean-while, the years roll by. There is the problem of physical health and one runs after drugs and panaceas. One works hard day and night and endures hunger, fatigue and disgust. Sleep, though balm-like and soothing, has its ludicrous aspects too when sometimes during sleep, one weeps, laughes or wakes up with horror. Also, one has to suffer the society of all manner of fools and ignorant people who can in no way help one on the path of realisation. As the span of life gets quickly depleted, one realises how much is still left to be done by way of investigating the truth of existence through warding off age-old, misleading tendencies of the mind. At the end of the day, it still is a tale of 'the little done and the vast undone'.

तत्रापि मारो यतते महापायनिपातने ।
तत्रासन्मार्गबाहुल्यं विचिकित्सा च दुर्जया ।।१६२ ।।।

162-163. There is also the constant attempt by 'māra' or the evil one to hurl a person into the dreadful lower realms. Under such circumstances it becomes difficult to overcome the tendency to take to the wrong path owing to a proliferation of (wrong) paths.

पुनश्च क्षणदौर्लभ्यं बुद्धोत्पादोऽतिदुर्लभः ।
क्लेशौघो दुर्निवारश्चत्यहो दुःखपरम्परा ।।१६३ ।।

Moreover, it is difficult to come by (this wealth of) the moment (of human existence) and equally difficult to have the presence of a Buddha (in one's midst). It is difficult to avoid the deluge of 'kleśas' also. Ah, what a continuous flow of suffering (for beings)!

Even when one has the privilege of a good birth, as in the case of human beings, the evil 'māra' does not relent but continues to tempt in order to finally get one condemned to 'narakas' or hells like 'avīchi'. There are so many unhealthy and harmful paths like those of the 'chārvākas' etc. that lure a person into their acceptance as the true path. In fact, there is no path truer than the bodhi-mārga. It is not easy to have a human birth and, as a human being, it is not easy to have 'kśana sampadā' or the wealth of the auspicious moment when one can have the guidance of a preceptor or the company of a 'kalyāna-itra' or the presence of a Buddha in his own life time. These must be taken advantage of, other-wise human life will become one long deluge of distorted conceptions and consequent sufferings.

अहो बतातिशोच्यत्वमेषां दुःखौघवर्तिनाम्।
ये नेक्षन्ते स्वदौःस्थित्यमेवमप्यतिदुःस्थिताः ।।१६४।।

164. Oh, one must feel serious concern for such beings as are adrift in an ocean of suffering and, out of rank ignorance, are unable to be aware of their own torture even though deep in its throes.

Therefore, the welfare of all sentient beings must be everybody's chief concern. The 'sattvas', although in a terrible mess and in the jaws of awesome 'dukha', are unaware of their own plight due to their colossal ignorance. These are the ones who must be saved through compassion.

स्नात्वा स्नात्वा यथा कश्चिद् विशेद् वह्निं मुहुर्मुहुः।
स्वसौस्थित्यं च मन्यन्ते एवमप्यतिदुःस्थिताः ।१६५।।

165-166. Just as a mad person bathes again and again and then goes to the fire (to seek warmth) and feels happy, so do sentient beings (indulging in unwholesome actions) regard their predicaments as happiness.

अजरामरलीलानामेवं विहरतां सताम्।
आयास्यन्त्यापदो घोराः कृत्वा मरणमग्रतः ।।१६६।।

Those who thus lead their lives as if they will never get old or as if they are immortals, are first over-taken by death and later have to suffer great tortures (in hells).

Even though all beings are surrounded by a welter of suffering all around they are not aware of their fate as they remain totally engrossed in material pursuits. Like a mad person who first jumps into cold waters again and again and then goes to the fire to warm himself, these mad fools also have no conception of good or evil. They know not what is beneficial and what is harmful for them. They go on pursuing their petty aims as if they have nothing better do. They never ponder over the inevitability of old age and death but continue getting bogged deeper and deeper into the slough of suffering. Finally, death comes and unto hells they are cast to face further sufferings.

एवं दुःखाग्नितप्तानां शान्तिं कुर्यामहं कदा।
पुण्यमेघसमुद्भूतैः सुखोपकरणैः स्वकैः।।१६७।।

167. When shall I, with the instrument of my own accumulated happiness born of the clouds of punyas' or meritorious actions, be able to offer solace to such as are tormented by the fire of suffering or 'dukha'.

One must practise 'karunā' or compassion with a 'pariṇāmanā' as follows, 'let me offer solace to all suffering beings by dedicating all the happiness of my own 'punyas' or meritorious actions to their well-being. Let them have food, clothing, medicines and the wherewithal to lead a healthy happy life.'

कदोपलंभदृष्टिभ्यो देशयिष्यामि शून्यताम्।
संवृत्यानुपलंभेन पुण्यसंभारमादरात्।।१६८।।

168. When shall I, after accumulating my own 'punya', through not being propped by 'sam-

vritti', be able to teach with dignity 'śunyatā' or emptiness to those who are steeped in the wretchedness of their own existence?

One should undertake the 'samkalpa' or vow: "let my own merit rest on a true realisation of emptiness unaided by the concept of 'samvritti'. Let my merit, so collected, help me in instructing those ignorant ones who are still steeped in 'samsāra' and are leading a miserable existence. May I be worthy of the task."

X—Pariṇāmnā

DEDICATION

बोधिचर्यावतारं मे *यद्विचिन्तयतः शुभम्।*
तेन सर्वे जनाः सन्तु *बोधिचर्याविभूषणाः ।।१ ।।*

1-3. Whatever 'śubha' or 'punya' (merit) has accrued to me by reflecting over bodhicharyāvatāra may, because of it, all beings become endowed (lit. decorated) with 'bodhi-charyā'.

सर्वासु दिक्षु यावन्तः कायचित्तव्यथातुराः।
ते प्राप्नुवन्तु मत्पुण्यैः सुखप्रामोद्यसागरान्।।२ ।।

May all those who move about in all directions, suffering from bodily and mental agony, obtain oceans of joy by virtue of my merits.

आसंसारं सुखज्यानिर्मा भूत् तेषां कदाचन।
बोधिसत्त्वसुखं प्राप्तं भवत्वविरतं जगत्।।३ ।।

May there never be a decline in their worldly joys and may the whole world become a recipient of the ceaseless joy of a bodhisattva.

Now Śāntideva proceeds to dedicate all the 'punya' which he may have gathered by the composition and the

teachings of this book on 'bodhi-charyā'. 'Parināmnā' or dedication of punya further augments merit and, like a drop becoming inexhaustible by merging with the ocean, merit so dedicated also becomes inexhaustible. Therefore, he prays that all beings may take to the bodhisattva conduct and attain 'bodhichitta',. May their physical and mental ailments disappear; may the supreme joys of a bodhisattva rain on their lives.

यावन्तो *नरकाः* केचिद् विद्यन्ते लोकधातुषु।
*सुखावतीसु*खामोद्यैर्मोदन्तां तेषु देहिनः ।।४।।

4-7. Whatsoever hells exist in 'loka-dhatu', may all beings in them be relieved of their tortures and may they be entertained with the joys of Sukhāvati.

शीतार्ताः प्राप्नुवन्त्तूष्णमुष्णार्ताः सन्तु शीतलाः।
बोधिसत्त्वमहामेघसंभवैर्जलसागरैः ।।५।।

May those oppressed by cold obtain heat and those oppressed by heat obtain coolness from the oceans of water of the conglomeration of the great clouds of bodhisattvas' merits or 'punyas'.

असिपत्रवनं तेषां स्यान्नन्दनवनद्युतिः ।
कूटशाल्मलिवृक्षाश्च जायन्तां कल्पपादपाः ।।६।।

May the forest of razor-sharp leaves be for them resplendent like the 'Nandana' grove (of god Indra) and may the sword and knife trees (of hells) become 'kalpa-vrikshas' for them.

कादंबकारण्डवचक्रवाकहंसादिकोलाहलरम्यशोभैः ।
सरोभिरुद्दामसरोजगन्धैर्भवन्तु हृद्या नरकप्रदेशाः ।।७।।

May the regions of hell become regions of delight with lotus pools full of fragrance pervading all over and beautifully resonant with the cries of swans ('hamsa'), anas casarca (chakravāka bird), ducks (kārandva) and (dark-grey) geese (kādamba).

'Lokadhātu' means a region or part of the world. It is a typically Buddhist term.

'Sukhāvati' is the heavenly abode of Buddhas.

सोऽङ्गारराशिर्मणिराशिरस्तु तप्ता च भूः स्फाटिककुट्टिमं स्यात् ।
भवन्तु संघातमहीधराश्च *पूजाविमानाः* सुगतप्रपूर्णाः ।।८।।

8-12. May heaps of burning coals change into gem-heaps; may the burning floor turn into a crystal marble floor; may the mountains of 'samghāta' (overbearing or crushing) hells become celestial palaces of worship filled by sugatas.

अङ्गारतप्तोपलशस्त्रवृष्टिरद्यप्रभृत्यस्तु च पुष्पवृष्टिः ।
तच्छस्त्रयुद्धं च परस्परेण क्रीडार्थमद्यास्तु च पुष्पयुद्धम् ।।९।।

May, from now onwards, the rain of fire-flames, of burning stones and fiery weapons become a rain of flowers and may mutual fighting with weapons turn into a playful, floral skirmish.

पतितसकलमांसाः कुन्दवर्णास्थिदेहा
दहनसमजलायां *वैतरण्यां* निमग्नाः।
मम कुशलबलेन प्राप्तदिव्यात्मभावाः
सह सुरवनिताभिः सन्तु *मन्दाकिनीस्थाः* ।।१० ।।

Attaining celestial forms through the power of my merits, may they whose all flesh has withered away, whose body and bones, have become lily white (i.e. bleached), who are drowned in the fiery waters of Vaitarani (river in hell), dwell on the banks of the Mandakini in the company of 'devis' (goddesses).

त्रस्ता पश्यन्त्वकस्मादिह यमपुरुषाः काकगृध्राश्च घोरा
ध्वान्तं ध्वस्तं समन्तात्सुखरतिजननी कस्य सौम्या प्रभेयम्।
इत्यूर्ध्वं प्रेक्षमाणा गगनतलगतं वज्रपाणिं ज्वलन्तं
दृष्ट्वा प्रामोद्यवेगाद्व्यपगतदुरिता यान्तु तेनैवसार्धम्।।११ ।।

पतति कमलवृष्टिर्गन्धपानीयमिश्राऽ
शमितनरकवह्निं दृश्यते नाशयन्ती।
किमिदमितिसुखेनाह्लदितानामकस्माद्
भवतु *कमलपाणेर्दर्शनं* नारकाणाम्।।१२ ।।

May the beings, looking sky-wards, behold on the firmament the resplendent form of (bodhisattva) Vajrapāni, whilst wondering as to whose all round joy-giving and darkness-dispelling, celestial light is that at whose sight the terrible messengers of yama, the crows and vultures are frightened. And, may they, through the immensity of their joy, be free from evil and his (i.e. Vajrapani's) company find. Seeing a rain of lotuses mixed

with fragrant water, extinguishing and destroying hell fires, their hearts dancing with joy, all of a sudden these hell-bound beings, wondering what it is, will have the sight of Padma-pāni (bodhisattva Avolikteśavara).

'Vaitarani' is a river in hell.

'Mandākini'- literally 'going or streaming slowly', is the name of an arm of the Ganga flowing down through the valley of Kedaranath in the Himalayas.

आयातायात शीघ्रं भयमपनयत भ्रातरो जीविताःस्मः
संप्राप्तोऽस्माकमेष ज्वलदभयकरः कोऽपि *चीरीकुमारः* ।
सर्वं यस्यानुभावाद् व्यसनमुपगतं प्रीतिवेगाः प्रवृत्ताः
जातं *संबोधिचितं सकलजनपरित्राणमाता* दया च ।।१३ ।।

13-15. O brothers! come, come quickly; shed all fear; we are alive (resurrected). We have got this radiant dispeller of fear, some 'chirī-kumāra', i.e. bodhisattva Mānjughosha, through whose power all suffering is removed, and we enter a flood of joy; sambodhi-chitta is born as also compassion,-the all-rescuing mother.

पश्यन्त्वेनं भवन्तः *सुरशतमुकुटैरर्च्यमानाङ्घ्रिपद्मं*
कारुण्यादार्द्रदृष्टिं शिरसि निपतितानेकपुष्पौघवृष्टिम् ।
कूटागारैर्मनोज्ञैः स्तुतिमुखरसुरस्त्रीसहस्त्रोपगीतै
र्दृष्ट्वाग्रे *मंजुघोषं* भवतु कलकलः सांप्रतः नारकाणाम् ।।१४ ।।

O, you see him whose lotus feet are being worshipped by the hundreds of crowns of gods, whose eyes are moist with compassion,

on whose head is being showered a rain of myriad flowers, whose beautiful palaces are resounding with a thousand songs of praise from the lips of goddesses. May there be a loud noise of joy from hell-bound beings on seeing Manjughosha in front of them like this:

इति मत्कुशलैः *समन्तभद्र प्रमुखानावृतबोधिसत्त्वमेघान्*।
सुखशीतसुगन्धवातवृष्टीनभिनन्दन्तु विलोक्य नारकास्ते ।।१५।।

May the hell-bound beings be happy to see, owing to my meritorious karma, the enveloping clouds (or groups) of bodhisattvas like Sāmantabhadra offering a rain of cool, fragrant and joyous breeze.

शाम्यन्तु वेदनास्तीव्रा नारकाणां भयानि च।
दुर्गतिभ्यो विमुच्यन्तां सर्वदुर्गतिवासिनः ।।१६।।

16-20. May they put to rest the severe pain and fear of hell-bound beings, and may they release from damnation all condemned beings.

अन्योन्यभक्षणभयं तिरश्चामपगच्छतु।
भवन्तु सुखिनः प्रेता यथोत्तरकुरौ नराः ।।१७।।

May the fear of being eaten by another in all animals disappear; may even the ghosts ('pretas') be as happy as men of Uttar-kuru region.

संतर्प्यन्तां प्रेताः स्नाप्यन्तां शीतला भवन्तु सदा।
*आर्यावलोकितेश्वर*करगलितक्षीरधाराभिः।।१८।।

May the ghosts be propitiated; may they be cooled and bathed in the stream of milk pouring from the hand of the noble lord Avalokiteśavara.

अंधाः पश्यन्तु रूपाणि श्रृण्वन्तु बधिराः सदा।
गर्भिण्यश्च प्रसूयन्तां *मायादेवीव* निव्यर्थथाः।।१९।।

May the blind see forms; may the deaf ever hear. May pregnant women deliver as painlessly as holy Māyādevi (Lord Buddha's mother).

वस्त्रभोजनपानीयं स्त्रक्चन्दनविभूषणम्।
मनोऽभिलाषितं सर्वं लभन्तां हितसंहितम्।।२०।।

May all get what is beneficial for them and whatever is desired,-clothes, food, water, ornaments of garlands as well as sandal-wood.

Uttar-Kuru or the country of the northern Kurus, situated in the north of India, was described in ancient times as a country of eternal beatitude.

भीताश्च निर्भयाः सन्तु शोकार्ताः प्रीतिलाभिनः।
उद्विग्नाश्च निरुद्वेगा धृतिमन्तो भवन्तु च।।२१।।

21-26. **May those in fear become fearless and the afflicted get joy. May the**

despondent be free from despair and be filled with fortitude.

आरोग्यं रोगिणामस्तु मुच्यन्तां सर्वबन्धनात्।
दुर्बला बलिनः सन्तु स्निग्धचित्ताः परस्परम्।।२२।।

May the ill be free from illness. May all be freed from all shackles. May the weak become strong. May people possess mutual warmth of hearts.

सर्वा दिशः शिवाः सन्तु सर्वेषां पथिवर्तिनाम्।
येन कार्येण गच्छन्ति तदुपायेन सिध्यतु।।२३।।

May all directions be beneficial for travellers. May they accomplish with effort the purpose of their journey.

नौयानयात्रारूडाश्च सन्तु सिद्धमनोरथाः।
क्षेमेण कूलमासाद्य रमन्तां सह बन्धुभिः।।२४।।

May those who journey by boat succeed in their objective. May they return to the bank safely in the midst of their relations.

कान्तारोन्मार्गपतिता लभन्तां सार्थसंगतिम्।
अश्रमेण च गच्छन्तु चौरव्याघ्रादिनिर्भयाः।।२५।।

May those who have lost their way on a jungle road and are desirous of having a fellow traveller, have their going made easy without any fear of thieves or wolves.

सुप्तमत्तप्रमत्तानां व्याध्यारण्यादिसंकटे।
अनाथबालवृद्धानां रक्षां कुर्वन्तु देवताः।।२६।।

May the gods protect the helpless, the children and the aged, the sleeping and the insane, and those who have fallen victims to a disease or been lost in a wilderness.

सर्वाक्षणविनिर्मुक्ताः श्रद्धाप्रज्ञाकृपान्विताः।
आकाराचारसंपन्नाः सन्तु *जातिस्मराः* सदा।।२७।।

27-31. May all beings be ever free from all 'akśana' and become endowed with faith, wisdom and kindness. May they be ever mindful and full of good bearing and good conduct.

भवन्त्वक्षयकोषाश्च यावद् गगनगंजवत्।
निर्द्वन्द्रा निरुपायासाः सन्तु *स्वाधीनवृत्तयः*।।२८।।

May all beings be inexhaustible treasures of riches like the treasury of space. May they be of nature free, devoid of dispute or trouble.

अल्पौजसश्च ये सत्त्वास्ते भवन्तु महौजसः।
भवन्तु रूपसंपन्ना ये *विरूपास्तपस्विनः*।।२९।।

May beings with little splendour be endowed with great splendour or 'ojasa'. May those ascetics who are ugly become beautiful.

या काश्चन स्त्रियो लोके पुरूषत्वं व्रजन्तु ताः ।
प्राप्नुवन्तूच्चतां नीचा हतमाना भवन्तु च ।।३० ।।

May those who are women in the world become masculine, May the lowly become great but shorn of conceit.

अनेन मम पुण्येन सर्वसत्त्वा ऽशेषतः ।
विरम्य सर्वपापेभ्यः कुर्वन्तु कुशलं सदा ।।३१ ।।

May all beings, with my merits, completely turn away from evil and constantly engage themselves in wholesome conduct.

बोधिचित्ताविरहिता बोधिचर्यापरायणाः
बुद्धैः परिगृहीताश्च मारकर्मविवर्जिताः ।।३२ ।

32. May they be never separated from bodhichitta but remain engaged in bodhicharyā. May they be accepted by the Buddhas and become refrained from the works of the devil ('māra').

'Māra' is the devil or the evil one who tempts people to indulge in passions. He is the great enemy of the Buddha and his dharma and, therefore, of every individual. The four aspects of 'mara' are: 'skandha-.māra', 'kleśa-māra', 'deva-putra-māra' and 'mrityu-māra', A later Buddhist theory of races of gods led to the figment of millions of 'māras' ruled over by a 'chief-māra', It was Lord Buddha's victory over 'mara' that made him the Enlightened One. That is why he is also called 'māra-jita'.

अप्रमेयायुषश्चैव सर्वसत्वा भवन्तु ते।
नित्यं जीवन्तु सुखिता मृत्युशब्दोऽपि नश्यतु ।।३३ ।।

33-37 May all beings be to you of immeasurable life-spans. May they ever live in joy. May even the word 'mrityu' or death be destroyed.

रम्याः कल्पद्रुमोद्यानैः दिशः सर्वाः भवन्तु च।
बुद्धबुद्धात्मजाकीर्णा धर्मध्वनिमनोहरैः।।३४।।

May all directions be beautiful with gardens of 'kalpavrikśas' and resounding with the delightful sounds of dharma scattered by Lord Buddha and his sons (i.e. bodhisattvas).

शर्करादिव्यपेता च समा पाणितलोपमा।
मृद्वी च वैडूर्यमयी भूमिः सर्वत्र तिष्ठतु।।३५।।

May the earth be smooth and full of lapis lazuli everywhere, level as the palm of a hand and covered by sweet things like sugar.

बोधिसत्त्वमहापर्षन्मंडलानि समन्ततः।
निषीदन्तु स्वशोभाभिर्मण्डयन्तु महीतलम्।।३६।।

May the bodhisattvas, encircling the mandalas on sides, dwell all over and, with their glory,-śobha,-adorn the surface of the earth.

पक्षिभ्यः सर्ववृक्षेभ्यो रश्मिभ्यो गगनादपि।
धर्मध्वनिरविश्रामं श्रूयतां सर्वदेहिभिः।।३७।।

May all creatures ceaselessly hear the sound

of dharma emanating from birds and all the trees and the beams of light and also from the sky.

बुद्धबुद्धसुतैर्नित्यं लभन्तां ते समागमम्।
पूजामेघैरनन्तैश्च पूजयन्तु *जागद्गुरुम्*।।३८।।

देवो वर्षतु कालेन सस्यसंपत्तिरस्तु च।
स्फीतो भवतु लोकश्च राजा भवतु धार्मिकः।।३९।।

38-43. May they always have the society of Lord Buddha and his sons (i.e. bodhisattvas) and may they worship with endless hosts of offerings the 'guru' of the world. May gods send rains in time and may there be a good wealth of harvests. May the people become pure and the king follow the dharma.

शक्ता भवन्तु चौषध्यो मन्त्राः सिध्यन्तु जापिनाम्।
भवन्तु करुणाविष्टा *डाकिनीराक्षसादयः*।।४०।।

May medicines be efficacious; may the mantras be realised by those who meditate on them. May the dakinis and the rakśasas be overcome by compassion.

मा कश्चिद् दुःखितः सत्त्वो मा पापी मा च रोगितः।
मा हीन्नः परिभूतो वा मा भूत् कश्चिच्च दुर्मनाः।।४१।।

May no being be in misery. May none be sinful or diseased. May none be mean, none be disregarded and none be despondent.

पाठस्वाध्यायकलिला विहाराः सन्तु सुस्थिताः ।
नित्यं स्यात्संघसामग्री *संघकार्यं* च सिध्यतु । ।४२ । ।

May the 'vihāras' be well-established, resounding with the sound of reading and pouring over the scriptures. May the Sangha ever possess its where-withal and may its work be accomplished.

विवेकलाभिनः सन्तु शिक्षाकामाश्च भिक्षवः ।
कर्मण्यचित्ताध्यायन्तु सर्वविक्षेपवर्जिताः । ।४३ । ।

May the bhikshus be recipients of wisdom as also eager to teach. And, forsaking all wandering thoughts, may they work without attaching their minds to actions.

लाभिन्यः सन्तु भिक्षुण्यः कलहायासवर्जिताः ।
भवन्त्वखण्डशीलाश्च सर्वे प्रव्रजितास्तथा । ।४४ । ।

44-50. May the 'bhikshunis' have gains or merit and may they be free from quarrels and harms; may, also, all the 'pravṛajita' nuns be of unsullied śila (i.e. unblemished conduct).

दुःशीलासन्तु संविग्नाः पापक्षयरताः सदा ।
सुगतेर्लाभिनः सन्तु तत्र चाखण्डितव्रताः । ।४५ । ।

May those with evil conduct be full of repentance and engaged in exhausting their evil (pāpa). May they attain the benefit of better realms through keeping their resolve intact.

पण्डिताः संस्कृताः सन्तु लाभिनः पैडंपातिकाः ।
भवन्तु शुद्धसंतानाः सर्वदिकख्यातकीर्तयः । ।४६ । ।

May the learned be honoured and may they receive the benefits of alms (pinda-pāta). May their thoughts be pure and may their unsullied glory spread in all directions.

अभुक्त्वापायिकं दुःखं विना दुष्करचर्यया ।
दिव्येनैकेन कायेन जगद्बुद्धत्त्वमाप्नुयात् । ।४७ । ।

May (the people of) the world, without suffering the agonies of lower realms, without the arduous 'charyā' or routine (of daily conduct) and with one divine body attain Buddha-hood.

पूज्यन्तां सर्वसंबुद्धाः सर्वसत्वैरनेकधा ।
अचिंत्यबौद्धसौरव्येन सुखिनः सन्तु भूयसा । ।४८ । ।

May all the Buddhas be worshipped in many ways by beings. May they be abundantly happy with the inconceivable joy of Buddhahood.

सिध्यन्तु बोधिसत्त्वानां जगदर्थं मनोरथाः ।
यच्चिन्तयन्ति ते नाथास्तत्सत्त्वानां समृध्यतु । ।४९ । ।

May the purposes of the bodhisattvas for (the good of) all beings be accomplished. May, whatever those masters have conceived, fructify for the beings.

प्रत्येकबुद्धाः सुखिनो भवन्तु *श्रावकास्तथा।*
देवासुरनरैर्नित्यं पूज्यमानाः सगौरवैः।।५०।।*

May 'pratyeka-buddhas' and 'śrāvakas', being ever worshipped with pride by gods, demons and men, be happy and pleased with their worship.

जातिस्मरत्वं प्रव्रज्यामहं च प्राप्नुयां सदा।
यावत्प्रमुदिताभूमिं मंजुघोषपरिग्रहात्।।५१।।

51-56. May I continue to retain the memory of past lives (jāti) as also (my) ordination vows ('pravrajyā) till I attain the level of joyousness ('pramuditā bhūmi').

येन तेनाशनेनाहं याययेयं बलान्वितः।
विवेकवाससामग्रीं प्राप्नुयां सर्वजातिषु।।५२।।

May I attain that where-withal for wisdom in all lives by eating which I may be endowed with the strength to spend my life happily (in the practice of dharma).

यदा च द्रष्टुकामः स्यां प्रष्टुकामःश्च किंचन।
तमेव नाथं पश्येयं *मंजुनाथमविध्रतः*।।५३।।

Wherever I may have the wish to see or ask a question, may I clearly behold the very Lord Manjughosha himself (before me).

दशदिग्व्योमपर्यन्तसर्वसत्वार्थसाधने।
यथा चरति *मंजुश्रीः* सैव चर्या भवेन्मम।।५४।।

May my conduct be the same as that of Manjughosha for ministering to the needs of sattvas in all the ten directions upto the sky itself.

आकाशस्यस्थितिर्यावद्यावच्च जगतः स्थितिः।
तावन्मम स्थितिर्भूयात् जगद्दुःखानि निघ्नतः।।५५।।

May I live for as long as the sky and the (transient) world exist in order to destroy the 'dukhas' of the world.

यत्किंचिज्जगतो दुःखं तत्सर्वंमयि पच्यताम्।
बोधिसत्त्वशुभैः सर्वैर्जगत् सुखितमस्तु च।।५६।

Whatever the dukha of the world, may all that ripen on me and may the whole (transient) world be happy owing to the merits or 'punyas' of bodhisattvas.

जगद्दुःखैकभैषज्यं सर्वसंपत्सुखाकरम्।
लाभसत्कारसहितं चिरं तिष्ठतु *शासनम्*।।५७।।

57-58. (May the teaching ('śāsana') which is the only cure for the misery of the world and the source of all the wealth of joy, with honour and reverence, endure for-ever.

मंजुघोषं नमस्यामि यत्प्रसादान्मतिः शुभे।
कल्याणमित्रं वन्देऽहं सत्प्रसादाच्च वर्धते।।५८।।

I bow to Manjughosha by whose grace my

faculties were yoked to wholesome work; I bow to the beneficent friend ('kalyāna-mitra') by whose grace it (the tendency for 'śubha') developed (in my mind).

Thus ends Bodhicharyāratāra, the work of Arya Śān-tideva.